



Special School District

**Disaggregated Data Review
Program Evaluation**

Paul Bauer, Chair

Mike Rogg, Chair

Board Approved: March 22, 2011



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Executive Summary

As required by the Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) standards, the Board must annually review performance data disaggregated based on race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, disability, migrant, and/or LEP students in order effectively monitor student academic achievement and dropout/persistence to graduation rates. The questions addressed in this review are as follows: *Is district performance on state assessments improving every year?* , *Do students in each subgroup perform at comparable levels?* , *Did SSD make Adequate Yearly Progress in 2010?* The present evaluation includes a review of achievement and AYP data. Based on a review of the data, strengths, concerns and recommendations are noted.

Results

Special Education Schools, POS Agencies and Court Programs

Strengths

- Review of GLA/EOC/MAP-A performance shows that overall scores have increased over the last three years for students in special education schools.
- Although the percentage of students in the “Proficient” and “Advanced” categories was much higher for MAP-A students than GLA/EOC students, both groups showed improved scores.
- All five special education schools met achievement standards and other indicators for AYP. Courts programs met AYP requirement in Communication Arts.
- Gender- and ethnic achievement gaps are narrowing.
- Scores for students in POS agencies increased over the previous year.

Concerns

- The scores of students taking the GLA/EOC increased, but are still far lower than students participating in the MAP-A.
- Although achievement gaps are narrowing, they still exist.
- Students not receiving free/reduced lunch scored higher than students receiving free/reduced lunch, indicating variation by social-economic status.
- Finally, students in Courts programs without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in Communication Arts and Mathematics.

Recommendations

- Schools should analyze GLA/EOC scores to identify specific skills or areas needing extra attention in instruction. Where appropriate, targeted interventions should be provided in those areas.
- The district should continue implementation of the Communication Arts and Math curriculum guides and curriculum materials. This guides and materials are closely



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

aligned with state standards and are designed to develop student skills, which should result in improved scores on assessments.

- Schools should continue to implement standards-based instruction and continuous formative student assessments, using data teams to analyze student performance data and modify instruction as indicated by the data. This includes adoption of a standard program to teach writing that is aligned with existing monthly writing assessments.
- Schools should continue to emphasize improving student attendance and providing students supports to meet graduation requirements, including credit recovery programs. School teams should identify specific attendance issues and interventions to address them.

Technical Education Schools

Strengths

- 1) Student performance meets achievement standards for AYP in all areas for North Technical School for all Disaggregated Groups in all three Academic years reviewed.
- 2) Student performance is trending in a positive direction for both Mathematics and Communication Arts. Only a single Frequency of a student scoring Below Basic in Mathematics occurred out of 14 total Frequencies. No Frequencies of a total of 82 Frequencies in Communications Arts were Below Basic.
- 3) North Technical School represents a unique opportunity for integration of Academics and Technical coursework due to the academic offerings that complement Technical Program offerings.

Concerns

- 1) Performance of selected disaggregated groups demonstrating inconsistent gains; measuring gains is complicated by the small number of students in some Disaggregated Groups.
- 2) Meeting MSIP standard 9.1.3 continues to be a concern; performance for an identified statewide minority group did not improve at the same rate as non-minority group.

Recommendations

- 1) Apply strategies that integrate STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) skills across Program Curriculum.
- 2) Technical Schools should examine the use of Post Secondary Placement assessments to measure student readiness for matriculation into post secondary institutions to positively affect Post Secondary student placement.
- 3) Revise assessment Plan to utilize KeyTrain to remediate student academic skills; KeyTrain tracks student performance level as student completes academic exercises designed to improve student performance in Math and Communication Skills. It is anticipated student performance would improve simultaneously in WorkKeys and Mathematics EOC as student complete the KeyTrain Program.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Question(s)

Is district performance on state assessments improving every year?
Do students in each subgroup perform at comparable levels?
Did SSD make Adequate Yearly Progress in 2010?

Report Information

1. Name of Program or Services:
GLA (Grade Level Assessments)/EOC/MAP-A Disaggregated Data Review
2. Personnel Responsible for Report:
Paul Bauer
Mike Rogg
3. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):
February 2011
4. Brief description of report related to MSIP Standards:
MSIP Standard 6.2.3 requires that the Board annually review performance data disaggregated based on race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, disability, migrant, and/or LEP students in order to effectively monitor student academic achievement and dropout/persistence to graduation rates.

Results

The following report reviews GLA (Grade Level Assessments), End-of-Course, and MAP-A data for students taking the Communication Arts and Mathematics assessments in SSD schools and programs. Where applicable, the data are disaggregated according to MSIP Standard 6.2.3. Assessment data are presented for three years (2008-2010) so that trends may be reviewed. The reader should note that in 2009 DESE replaced MAP assessments for grades 10 and 11 with End of Course (EOC) assessments for Algebra 1, English II, and Biology. For 2010, American Government was added. Although the GLA assessments are not directly comparable to EOC assessments, DESE uses the same score classifications (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced). However, although the classifications are the same, evaluation of performance trends across multiple years should take this into account. The report is formatted as follows:

- Section I. Special Education Schools (page 5)
POS Agencies (page 13)
Court Programs (page 19)
Adequate Yearly Progress: Spcl. Education Schools and Courts (page 25)
- Section II. Technical Education Schools (page 28)
Adequate Yearly Progress: Technical Education Schools (page 36)
- Section III. Summary and Recommendations (page 38)



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Section I: Special Education Schools, POS Agencies and Court Programs

Special Education Schools

Test results from special education schools include students attending Ackerman School (grades K-8) Northview High School (grades 9-12), Litzsinger School (grades K-8), Neuwoehner High School (grades 9-12), Southview School (grades K-12), and the Bridges Program (grades 7-12). Although required by DESE to satisfy MSIP requirements, this section does not disaggregate scores for disabled/non-disabled students because every student in the special education schools has a disability. Similarly, the report does not disaggregate for students with Limited English Proficiency. Although students in special education schools may have in the past been identified in this category, their needs result primarily from their educational disability and are met through the special education programs provided in the schools. Aggregate GLA scores for all special education schools are reported in Table 1 for 2008 through 2010.

Table 1. Special Education Schools - Communication Arts and Mathematics

Content Area	Level	2008		2009		2010	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Communication Arts	LND	1	.3	2	.5	2	.5
	Below Basic	104	26.1	56	14.6	48	12.9
	Basic	94	23.6	96	25.1	71	19.1
	Proficient	81	20.3	93	24.3	93	25.1
	Advanced	119	29.8	136	35.5	157	42.3
	Total	399	100.0	383	100.0	371	100.0
Mathematics	LND	1	.3	1	.3	0	0
	Below Basic	130	32.5	85	21.3	61	17.0
	Basic	53	13.3	52	13.3	52	14.5
	Proficient	79	19.8	89	22.8	104	29.1
	Advanced	137	34.3	163	41.8	141	39.4
	Total	400	100.0	390	100.0	358	100.0

The above table shows that performance in Communication Arts and Mathematics has substantially improved over the last three years. Over that time, the percentage of students scoring “Advanced” or “Proficient” in Communication Arts increased from 50.1% to 67.4%, and the percentage in Mathematics increased from 54.1% to 68.5%. The percentage of students categorized as “Level Not Determined” in Communication Arts remained at .5% level for 2009 and 2010. In Mathematics, the percentage of such students decreased to zero.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Race/Ethnicity

DESE disaggregates students into five ethnic groups: American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, and White. Disaggregated scores based on ethnicity are reported in Table 2 (Communication Arts) and Table 3 (Mathematics). Selected ethnic groups are not reported because no students were identified in the group, or very few students (less than 10) were identified in a given year: the low numbers may compromise confidentiality if reported.

Table 2. Special Education Schools – Communication Arts: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Black	LND	1	0.5	1	0.6	1	0.6
		Below Basic	71	35.1	38	22.1	30	17.1
		Basic	37	18.3	40	23.3	32	18.3
		Proficient	36	17.8	29	16.9	40	22.9
		Advanced	57	28.2	64	37.2	72	41.1
		Total	202	100.0	172	100.0	174	100.0
	White	LND	0	0	1	0.5	0	0
		Below Basic	31	16.7	18	8.8	18	9.7
		Basic	55	29.6	55	26.8	39	21.0
		Proficient	42	22.6	62	30.2	51	27.4
		Advanced	58	31.2	69	33.7	78	41.9
		Total	186	100.0	205	100.0	186	100.0

Since 2008, both Black students (46.0% to 64.0%) and White students (53.8% to 69.3%) showed increases in the percentage of students in the “Advanced” or “Proficient” ranges. The percentage of Black students in the “Level Not Determined” remained at 0.6% for both 2009 and 2010 while White students decreased from 0.5% to zero. The percentage of White students in the top two categories is higher than the percentage of Black students. However, the achievement gap has narrowed: The number of percentage points separating the two groups has decreased from 7.8 to 5.3, and Black students showed an increase 18 percentage points, while White students showed an increase of 15.5 percentage points.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 3. Special Education Schools - Mathematics: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Black	LND	1	0.5	1	0.6	0	0
		Below Basic	82	40.8	52	29.2	43	25.6
		Basic	19	9.5	15	8.4	20	11.9
		Proficient	41	20.4	35	19.7	43	25.6
		Advanced	58	28.9	75	42.1	62	36.9
		Total	201	100.0	178	100.0	168	100.0
	White	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	47	24.6	33	16.2	18	9.8
		Basic	32	16.8	37	18.1	32	17.5
		Proficient	36	18.8	52	25.5	58	31.7
		Advanced	76	39.8	82	40.2	75	41.0
		Total	191	100.0	204	100.0	183	100.0

The above table shows that the percentage of Black students scoring “Advanced” or “Proficient” in Mathematics increased from 49.3% to 62.5% during the past three years, while the percentage of White students in these two score categories increased from 58.6% to 72.7%. The percentage of Black students in the “Level Not Determined” category decreased from .06% to 0%. The percentage of White students in this category remained at zero. The size of the achievement gap in Mathematics has grown from 9.3 percentage points to 10.5 percentage points. In addition, the percentage of Black students in the top two categories has grown by 13.2 percentage points, while the increase for White students has grown by 14.1 points.

Gender

DESE disaggregates students by gender as well with regard to MAP performance.

Disaggregated scores based on gender are reported in Table 4 (Communication Arts) and Table 5 (Mathematics).



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 4. Special Education Schools - Communication Arts: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Female	LND	0	0	1	.9	0	0
		Below Basic	26	21.5	9	8.2	5	4.5
		Basic	26	21.5	24	21.8	14	12.7
		Proficient	31	25.6	34	30.9	38	34.5
		Advanced	38	31.4	42	38.2	53	48.2
		Total	121	100.0	110	100.0	110	100.0
	Male	LND	1	0.4	1	.4	2	.8
		Below Basic	78	28.1	47	17.2	43	16.5
		Basic	68	24.5	72	26.4	57	21.8
		Proficient	50	18.0	59	21.6	55	21.1
		Advanced	81	29.1	94	34.4	104	39.18
		Total	278	100.0	273	100.0	261	100.0

Examination of growth over the last three years shows that female students have out-performed male students. The percentage of females in the top two categories increased from 57.0% to 82.7% while the percentage of males in these categories increased from 47.1% to 60.28%. The percentage of females in the “Level Not Determined” category decreased from .9% to zero, while the percentage of males increased from .4% to .8%.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 5. Special Education Schools - Mathematics: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Female	LND	0	0	1	0.8	0	0
		Below Basic	26	23.4	15	12.6	12	12.0
		Basic	10	9.0	6	5.0	9	9.0
		Proficient	36	32.4	36	30.3	38	38.0
		Advanced	39	35.1	61	51.3	41	41.0
		Total	111	100.0	119	100.0	100	100.0
	Male	LND	1	.3	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	104	36.0	70	25.8	49	19.0
		Basic	41	14.2	46	17.0	43	16.7
		Proficient	44	15.2	53	19.6	66	25.6
		Advanced	99	34.3	102	37.6	100	38.8
		Total	289	100.0	271	100.0	258	100.0

The above table shows that females also out-performed males in Mathematics. Scores of females increased over the last three years from 67.5% in the top two categories to 79.0%, while scores of males increased from 49.5% in the top two categories to 64.4%.

Socioeconomic Status (Free/Reduced Lunch)

Disaggregated scores for Special Education Schools based on socioeconomic status (free/reduced lunch) are reported in Table 6 (Communication Arts) and Table 7 (Mathematics).



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 6. Special Education Schools – Communication Arts: Free/Reduced Lunch

Content Area	Free/Reduced Lunch	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	No	LND	1	.5	1	.6	1	.6
		Below Basic	33	16.3	17	9.7	10	6.2
		Basic	51	25.2	46	26.3	32	20.0
		Proficient	46	22.8	51	29.1	53	33.1
		Advanced	71	35.1	60	34.3	64	40.0
		Total	202	100.0	175	100.0	159	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	1	.5	1	.5
		Below Basic	71	36.0	39	18.8	38	18.0
		Basic	43	21.8	50	24.0	39	18.5
		Proficient	35	17.8	42	20.2	40	19.0
		Advanced	48	24.4	76	36.5	93	44.1
		Total	197	100.0	208	100.0	211	100.0

A review of performance by students receiving and not receiving free or reduced lunch shows that in Communication Arts, the percentage of students scoring “Proficient” or “Advanced” was higher for students not receiving free or reduced lunch (73.1% as compared to 63.1%). In addition, students not receiving free or reduced lunch showed greater growth in scores over three years, with an increase from 57.9% “Proficient” or “Advanced” to 73.1% in those two categories in contrast to an increase from 42.2% to 63.1% for students receiving free or reduced lunch. Therefore, students receiving free or reduced lunch have narrowed, but not eliminated, an achievement gap.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 7. Special Education Schools – Mathematics: Free/Reduced Lunch

Content Area	Free/Reduced Lunch	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	No	LND	1	0.5	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	45	23.3	25	14.3	13	8.1
		Basic	25	13.0	32	18.3	27	16.9
		Proficient	38	19.7	45	25.7	54	33.8
		Advanced	84	43.5	73	41.7	66	41.2
		Total	193	100.0	175	100.0	160	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	1	0.5	0	0
		Below Basic	85	41.1	60	27.9	48	24.2
		Basic	26	12.6	20	9.3	25	12.6
		Proficient	42	20.3	44	20.5	50	25.3
		Advanced	54	26.1	90	41.9	75	37.9
		Total	207	100.0	215	100.0	198	100.0

The Mathematics data above show students not receiving free or reduced lunch scored higher as a group than those receiving free or reduced lunch. The percentage of students not receiving free or reduced lunch who scored in the top two categories increased over three years from 63.2% to 75.0%. Students receiving free or reduced lunch showed an increase from 46.4% to 63.2% over three years. In this content area, the achievement gap narrowed, but students who receive free or reduced lunch still lag behind those who do not.

GLA/EOC and MAP-A Trends

Table 8 compares performance data for GLA/EOC and MAP-A assessments. End-of-Course (EOC) assessments replaced the MAP at grades 10 and 11 in 2009 and are also included in the 2010 results below. Data for the Special Education Schools are listed in Table 8. Data for the Purchase of Service (POS) agencies are listed in Table 13.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 8. Special Education Schools: GLA/EOC and MAP-A

Content Area	Test	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	MAP	LND	1	.6	2	1.5	0	0
		Below Basic	98	61.6	53	40.5	42	37.5
		Basic	49	30.8	61	46.6	57	50.9
		Proficient	10	6.3	14	10.7	13	11.6
		Advanced	1	.6	1	0.8	0	0
		Total	159	100.0	131	100.0	112	100.0
	MAP-A	LND	0	0	0	0	2	.8
		Below Basic	6	2.5	3	1.2	6	2.3
		Basic	45	18.8	35	13.9	14	5.4
		Proficient	71	29.6	79	31.3	80	30.9
		Advanced	118	49.2	135	53.6	157	60.6
		Total	240	100.0	252	100.0	259	100.0
Mathematics	MAP	LND	1	0.6	1	0.7	0	0
		Below Basic	122	75.8	82	61.2	58	52.7
		Basic	32	19.9	42	31.3	43	39.1
		Proficient	6	3.7	8	6.0	9	8.2
		Advanced	0	0	1	.7	0	0
		Total	161	100.0	134	100.0	110	100
	MAP-A	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	8	3.3	3	1.2	3	1.2
		Basic	19	7.9	10	3.9	9	3.6
		Proficient	74	31.0	81	31.6	95	38.3
		Advanced	138	57.7	162	63.3	141	56.9
		Total	239	100.0	256	100.0	248	100.0

Student performance on the MAP-A was significantly higher than performance on the standard GLA for both Communication Arts and Mathematics. In the area of Communication Arts, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the MAP-A increased thirteen percentage points from 2008 (78.8%) to 2010 (91.5%). The percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the standard GLA increased by about five percentage points from 2008 (6.9%) to 2010 (11.6%). In the area of Mathematics, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the MAP-A increased 6.5% from 2008 (88.7%) to 2010 (95.2%). The percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the standard GLA increased by almost five percentage points from 2008 (3.7%) to 2010 (8.2%).



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Purchase of Service Agencies (POS)

Test results for Purchase of Service (POS) agencies include those for students attending the following private separate schools: Epworth School, Edgewood Children’s Center, Marygrove, Evangelical Children’s Home, St. Vincent’s Home, Logos School, Giant Steps, and Center for Autism Education. As in the special education (public separate) schools, every student enrolled in those schools through SSD has a disability, and no students are recorded as being English Language Learners. Lunches are provided by the agencies, thus data are not disaggregated for these variables. Aggregate MAP scores for all POS agencies are reported in Table 9 for 2008 through 2010.

Table 9. Purchase of Service Agencies – Communication Arts and Mathematics

Content Area	Level	2008		2009		2010	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Communication Arts	LND	0	0	2	3.9	5	7.7
	Below Basic	58	66.7	29	56.9	37	56.9
	Basic	20	23.0	18	35.3	12	18.5
	Proficient	6	6.9	2	3.9	7	10.8
	Advanced	3	3.4	0	0	4	6.2
	Total	87	100.0	51	100.0	65	100.0
Mathematics	LND	0	0	4	7.7	7	9.6
	Below Basic	60	70.6	38	73.1	44	60.3
	Basic	14	16.5	8	15.4	13	17.8
	Proficient	9	10.6	0	0	4	5.5
	Advanced	2	2.4	2	3.8	5	6.8
	Total	85	100.0	52	100.0	73	100.0

The percentage of students scoring in the “Proficient” or “Advanced” ranges in Communication Arts increased from 10.3% to 17.0%. The percentage in those ranges in Mathematics decreased from 13.0% to 12.3%. In addition, the percentage of students in the “Level Not Determined” category for both content areas increased from last year.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Race/Ethnicity

Table 10 (Communication Arts) and Table 11 (Mathematics) report disaggregated MAP data based on ethnicity. Similar to the previous section, disaggregated data for selected ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic) are not reported because no students were identified in the group, or very few students (less than 10) were identified in a given year which may compromise confidentiality if reported.

Table 10. POS Communication Arts: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Black	LND	0	0	2	8.7	2	7.1
		Below Basic	33	84.6	14	60.9	19	67.9
		Basic	4	10.3	7	30.4	5	17.9
		Proficient	1	2.6	0	0.0	1	3.6
		Advanced	1	2.6	0	0.0	1	3.6
		Total	39	100.0	23	100.0	28	100.0
	White	LND	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.3
		Below Basic	25	52.1	14	51.9	17	47.2
		Basic	16	33.3	11	40.7	7	19.4
		Proficient	5	10.4	2	7.4	6	16.7
		Advanced	2	4.2	0	0.0	3	8.3
		Total	48	100.0	27	100.0	36	100.0

The Communication Arts data above indicate a substantial difference in the performance of Black and White students. While the percentage of students in the top two score categories increased for both groups (from 0% to 7.2% of Black students and from 7.4% to 25.0% of White students), the percentage of White students scoring “Proficient” or “Advanced” and 2010 was still higher than that of Black students.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 11. POS Mathematics: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Black	LND	0	0	2	8.7	4	13.8
		Below Basic	35	85.4	19	82.6	19	65.5
		Basic	3	7.3	2	8.7	5	17.2
		Proficient	3	7.3	0	0.0	0	0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	1	3.4
		Total	41	100.0	23	100.0	29	100.0
	White	LND	0	0.0	2	7.1	3	7.3
		Below Basic	25	56.8	18	64.3	23	56.1
		Basic	11	25.0	6	21.4	7	17.1
		Proficient	6	13.6	0	0.0	4	9.8
		Advanced	2	4.5	2	7.1	4	9.8
		Total	44	100.0	28	100.0	41	100.0

The percentage of Black students in the “Advanced” or “Proficient” range increased in 2010 (3.4%) compared to 2009 (0%). White students in those categories also increased, from 7.1% in 2009 to 19.6% in 2010. In addition, the percentage of Black students in the “Level Not Determined” group increased from 8.7% to 13.8%, while the percentage of White students in this category slightly increased from 7.1% to 7.3%.

Gender

Disaggregated scores for POS agencies based on gender are reported in Table 12 (Communication Arts) and Table 13 (Mathematics).

Table 12. POS Communication Arts: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Female	LND	0	0	0	0.0	1	7.7
		Below Basic	20	80.0	5	62.5	6	46.2
		Basic	3	12.0	3	37.5	5	38.5
		Proficient	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0
		Advanced	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	7.7
		Total	25	100.0	8	100.0	13	100.0
	Male	LND	0	0.0	2	4.7	4	7.7
		Below Basic	38	61.3	24	55.8	31	59.6
		Basic	17	27.4	15	34.9	7	13.5



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

		Proficient	5	8.1	2	4.7	7	13.5
		Advanced	2	3.2	0	0.0	3	5.8
		Total	62	100.0	43	100.0	52	100.0

As shown above, performance of male and female students differed in Communication Arts. The percentage of female students in the “Proficient” or “Advanced” categories increased from 2009 and 2010 scores in Communication Arts (from 0% to 7.7%) while the percentage of male students increased but still remained higher (from 4.7% to 19.3%).

Table 13. POS Mathematics: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Female	LND	0	0	2	25.0	1	7.7
		Below Basic	17	89.5	5	62.5	8	61.5
		Basic	1	5.3	1	12.5	2	15.4
		Proficient	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	7.7
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	1	7.7
		Total	19	100.0	8	100.0	13	100.0
	Male	LND	0	0.0	2	4.5	6	10.0
		Below Basic	43	66.2	33	75.0	36	60.0
		Basic	13	20.0	7	15.9	11	18.3
		Proficient	8	12.3	0	0.0	3	5.0
		Advanced	1	1.5	2	4.5	4	6.7
		Total	65	100.0	44	100.0	60	100.0

In Mathematics, the percentage of students in the top two categories increased from 2009 to 2010 for both male (from 4.5% to 11.7%) and female (from 0% to 15.4%) students. The 2010 data indicate the percentage of female students in the top two score categories was higher compared to males. It should be noted that the 2009 scores decreased from 2008.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 14. Purchase of Service Agency (POS): GLA/EOC and MAP-A

Content Area	Test	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	MAP	LND	0	0	2	4.1	5	8.6
		Below Basic	52	69.3	28	57.1	37	63.8
		Basic	17	22.7	17	34.7	10	17.2
		Proficient	5	6.7	2	4.1	6	10.3
		Advanced	1	1.3	0	0	0	0
		Total	75	100.0	49	100.0	58	100.0
	MAP-A	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	6	50.0	1	50.0	0	0
		Basic	3	25.0	1	50.0	2	28.6
		Proficient	1	8.3	0	0	1	14.3
		Advanced	2	16.7	0	0	4	57.1
		Total	12	100.0	2	100.0	7	100.0
Mathematics	MAP	LND	0	0	4	8.2	7	10.6
		Below Basic	56	76.7	38	77.6	43	65.2
		Basic	13	17.8	7	14.3	13	19.7
		Proficient	3	4.1	0	0	2	3.0
		Advanced	1	1.4	0	0	1	1.5
		Total	73	100.0	49	100.0	66	100.0
	MAP-A	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	4	33.3	0	0	1	14.3
		Basic	1	8.3	1	33.3	0	0
		Proficient	6	50.0	0	0	2	28.6
		Advanced	1	8.3	2	66.7	4	57.1
		Total	12	100.0	3	100.0	7	100.0

A very small number of students in POS settings participated in the MAP-A. This was because most MAP-A-eligible students in POS settings attend their home schools part-time and responsibility for the assessment rests with those home schools. Despite the small numbers, student performance on the MAP-A was better than performance on the standard GLA/EOC for Communication Arts (10.3% of students “Proficient” on the GLA/EOC versus 71.4% students “Proficient” in the MAP-A). In Mathematics, 4.5% of students were “Proficient” or “Advanced” on the standard GLA/EOC, while 85.7% were “Proficient” or “Advanced” on the MAP-A.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Comparison Data

A comparison of 2010 GLA and EOC performance for public separate schools and private separate schools showed that students in public separate schools out-performed those in POS agencies. This is shown in the table below:

	Public Separate Schools	POS Agencies
<u>Communication Arts</u>		
Percent Proficient/Advanced	11.6	10.3
Percent Level Not Determined	0.0	8.6
<u>Mathematics</u>		
Percent Proficient/Advanced	8.2	4.5
Percent Level Not Determined	0.0	10.6

The above data show the following: (1) A higher percentage of students attending the SSD public separate schools score in the Proficient/Advanced range than in POS agencies, and (2) a higher percentage of students in POS agencies have a Level Not Determined than in public separate schools. Both of these findings are significant: First, schools must have as many students as possible in the Advanced/Proficient ranges to meet AYP requirements. Second, if a district has more than 5% of its students in the Level Not Determined Category, DESE will rule that that school does not meet achievement standards, regardless of the percentages of students in other categories.

Court Programs

Court Programs include students attending Lakeside Center, Project Learn, and the Juvenile Detention Center. No students were noted as being identified as English Language Learners. In addition, all students in the Court Programs receive free lunch. Thus, data are not disaggregated for these variables. Aggregate GLA/EOC scores for all Courts agencies are reported in Table 15 for 2008 through 2010

Table 15. Court Programs GLA/EOC Results

Content Area	Level	2008		2009		2010	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Communication Arts	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Below Basic	18	37.5	1	8.3	3	14.3
	Basic	25	52.1	10	83.3	11	52.4
	Proficient	5	10.4	1	8.3	7	33.3
	Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

	Total	48	100.0	12	100.0	21	100.0
Mathematics	LND	0	0	0	0	1	3.7
	Below Basic	54	72.0	15	45.5	11	40.7
	Basic	16	21.3	15	45.5	12	44.4
	Proficient	5	6.7	3	9.1	1	3.7
	Advanced	0	0	0	0	2	7.4
	Total	75	100.0	33	100.0	27	100.0

In Communication Arts, the percentage of students at these schools who scored “Proficient” or “Advanced” increased from 8.3% to 33.3% in 2010. The percentage of students in those two groups in Mathematics also increased, from 9.1% in 2009 to 11.1% in 2010.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 16 (Communication Arts) and Table 17 (Mathematics) report disaggregated GLA/EOC data. Similar to the previous sections, disaggregated data for selected ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic) are not reported due to the fact that no students were identified in the group, or very few students (less than 10) were identified in a given year which may compromise confidentiality if reported.

Table 16 Court Programs - Communication Arts: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Black	LND	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Below Basic	16	42.1	1	9.1	3	17.6
		Basic	18	47.4	9	81.8	10	58.8
		Proficient	4	10.5	1	9.1	4	23.5
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Total	38	100.0	11	100.0	17	100.0
	White	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	2	20.0	0	0	0	0
		Basic	7	70.0	1	100.0	1	25.0
		Proficient	1	10.0	0	0	3	75.0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	10	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0

The majority of the students in the Court Program taking the Communication Arts assessment (over 81%) were Black. In Communication Arts, 23.5% of Black students scored “Proficient” while three White students (75%) scored “Proficient” (no students in either ethnic group were “Advanced”). It should be noted that because only four White students took the assessment



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

comparison is not meaningful. The performance of Black students increased slightly from last year (9.1% “Proficient” in 2009 to 23.5% 2010) while the performance of White students increased during that same period in a greater amount from 0% “Proficient” in 2009 to 75.0% in 2010).

Table 17. Court Programs - Mathematics: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Black	LND	0	0	0	0.0	1	4.0
		Below Basic	45	72.6	13	48.1	11	44.0
		Basic	13	21.0	13	48.1	11	44.0
		Proficient	4	6.5	1	3.7	1	4.0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	1	4.0
		Total	62	100.0	27	100.0	25	100.0
	White	LND	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Below Basic	9	69.2	2	33.3	0	0
		Basic	3	23.1	2	33.3	1	50.0
		Proficient	1	7.7	2	33.3	0	0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	1	50.0
		Total	13	100.0	6	100.0	2	100.0

In Mathematics, the percentage of Black students scoring at the “Proficient” or “Advanced” level in 2010 increased from 3.7% to 8.0%. The percentage of White students increased from 33.3% to 50.0%. The performance of Both Black and White students in Mathematics improved substantially. However, because there were only two White students, comparison is not meaningful.

Gender

Disaggregated scores for Court Programs based on gender are reported in Table 18 (Communication Arts) and Table 19 (Mathematics).

Table 18. Court Programs Communication Arts: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Female	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	3	37.5	0	0	1	25.0
		Basic	3	37.5	1	100.0	2	50.0
		Proficient	2	25.0	0	0	1	25.0



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

		Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	8	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0
	Male	LND	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Below Basic	15	37.5	1	9.1	2	11.8
		Basic	22	55.0	9	81.8	9	52.9
		Proficient	3	7.5	1	9.1	6	35.3
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Total	40	100.0	11	100.0	17	100.0

Of students taking the Communication Arts assessment, only four of 21 were female. The table shows that one female scored in “Proficient” range, while six of seventeen male students did so. The performance of males continues to improve, with an increase in the “Proficient” range from 7.5% in 2008 to 35.3% in 2010.

Table 19. Court Programs - Mathematics: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Female	LND	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Below Basic	7	58.3	2	28.6	1	20.0
		Basic	3	25.0	4	57.1	4	80.0
		Proficient	2	16.7	1	14.3	0	0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Total	12	100.0	7	100.0	5	100.0
	Male	LND	0	0	0	0.0	1	4.5
		Below Basic	47	74.6	13	50.0	10	45.5
		Basic	13	20.6	11	42.3	8	36.4
		Proficient	3	4.8	2	7.7	1	4.5
		Advanced	0	0	0	0.0	2	9.1
		Total	63	100.0	26	100.0	22	100.0

Again, the majority of students taking the GLA/EOC (almost four times as many) were male. The table shows that in Mathematics, no females scored in the “Proficient” or “Advanced” range while 13.6% of males did so. The performance of females decreased from 14.3% in 2009 to 0% in 2010. The performance of males continued to improve from 2008, with an increase from 4.8% to 7.7% to 13.6% in the “Proficient” or “Advanced range.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Disability (IEP Status)

Disaggregated scores for Court Programs based on disability (IEP status) are reported in Table 20 (Communication Arts) and Table 21 (Mathematics).

Table 20. Court Programs Communication Arts: IEP Status

Content Area	IEP Student	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	No	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	7	30.4	1	9.1	1	7.1
		Basic	12	52.2	10	90.9	7	50.0
		Proficient	4	17.4	0	0	6	42.9
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	23	100.0	11	100.0	14	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	11	44.0	0	0	2	28.6
		Basic	13	52.0	0	0	4	57.1
		Proficient	1	4.0	1	100.0	1	14.3
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	25	100.0	1	100.0	7	100.0

Only seven of 21 students taking the Communication Arts assessment had a disability. In 2010, students without IEPs scored higher than students without disabilities. No students scored in the “Advanced” range in either group.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 21. Court Programs - Mathematics: IEP Status

Content Area	IEP Student	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	No	LND	0	0	0	0	1	5.9
		Below Basic	23	59.0	13	43.3	4	23.5
		Basic	11	28.2	14	46.7	9	52.9
		Proficient	5	12.8	3	10.0	1	5.9
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	2	11.8
		Total	39	100.0	30	100.0	17	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	31	86.1	2	66.7	7	70.0
		Basic	5	13.9	1	33.3	3	30.0
		Proficient	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	36	100.0	3	100.0	10	100.0

Overall, students without disabilities as a group out-performed those with disabilities. The percentage of students without disabilities scoring “Proficient” or advanced increased from 10.0% in 2009 to 17.7% in 2010. The percentage of students without disabilities scoring “Advanced” increase from 0% in 2009 to 11.8% in 2010. While, no students with disabilities scored in the “Proficient” or “Advanced” range in 2009 and 2010.

Adequate Yearly Progress: Special Education Schools and Court Programs

Each year, districts receive a report of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). This report includes each school’s performance on meeting annual performance targets for achievements tests both as a total school as for each subgroup (race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, students with an IEP, and students with Limited English Proficiency).

Performance on Assessments

The AYP determination is based on performance of each school’s subgroup on Communication Arts and Mathematics assessments. To be included in the determination, a subgroup must include 30 students. Scores are counted only for students enrolled in the school on the last Wednesday in September, when memberships are first reported for the year. In 2010, the annual target for Communication Arts was 67.4% of students in the “Proficient” or “Advanced” range; for Mathematics the target was 63.3%.

The AYP status of each special education school and the Courts Program is reported below in Table 22. (“NA” indicates that no subgroups met the required group size.)



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 22. Adequate Yearly Progress: 2010 Subgroup Analysis

School	Communication Arts - 2010			Mathematics - 2010			Overall Achievement Targets
	School Total	Subgroups Met	Subgroups Not Met	School Total	Subgroups Met	Subgroups Not Met	
Ackerman	Met	Black F/R Lunch IEP	None	Met	Black F/R Lunch IEP	None	Met
Bridges	Not Met	NA	NA	Not Met	NA	NA	Not Met
Neuwoehner	Met	IEP	NA	Met	IEP	None	Met
Litzsinger	Met	Black White F/R Lunch IEP	None	Met	Black White F/R Lunch IEP	None	Met
Northview	Met	IEP	None	Met	NA	None	Met
Southview	Met	White IEP	None	Met	White IEP	None	Met
Court Program	Met	NA	NA	Not Met	NA	NA	Not Met

Additional Indicators

In addition to achievement scores, each school must make annual progress on an additional indicator. For elementary schools, attendance must be equal to or more than 93% or show any improvement from the previous year. For secondary schools, the graduation rate must be equal to or more than 85% or show any improvement from the previous year. If a school does not meet the additional indicator, the school will not have made Adequate Yearly Progress despite students' levels of achievement. Performance of each school on the additional indicator is noted in Table 23.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 23. AYP Additional Indicator: Special Education Schools and Courts Program

School	Additional Indicator	Indicator Status	Note
Ackerman	Attendance	Met	Attendance Increase from 91.4% to 92.1%
Bridges	Graduation Rate	Not Met	Graduation Rate Decrease from 33.3 to 0%
Neuwoehner	Graduation Rate	Met	Graduation Rate Decrease from 100% to 94.3%
Litzsinger	Attendance	Met	Attendance Increase from 91.2% to 92%
Northview	Graduation Rate	Met	Graduation Rate Decrease from 97.1% to 89.5%
Southview	Graduation Rate	Met	Graduation Rate Decrease from 100% to 94.4% Attendance Decrease from 92.5% to 91.7%
Court Program	Graduation Rate	Not Met	Graduation Rate Increase from 0% to 10.5%

This table shows that of K-8 schools, both Litzsinger and Ackerman met the Additional Indicator. Secondary schools (Neuwoehner and Northview) met the Additional Indicator due to their graduation rates. DESE utilizes graduation rate for Court Programs, and Bridges because their enrollment includes secondary students. DESE uses both indicators for Southview, a K-12 school: Southview met both standards. Conversely, according to the AYP report, neither Bridges nor Court Programs met the graduation rate standard because they did not have a sufficient graduation rate. However, students do not graduate from JDC, and only one student has ever graduated from Bridges (for the first time in 2009), as both are short-term programs in which it is not intended that students will complete graduation requirements. Based on the nature of these programs, the district has contacted DESE concerning the legitimacy of using graduation rates at Bridges and Court Programs.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Section II. Technical Education Schools

MAP data for the Technical Schools are disaggregated in similar fashion to the Special Education programs except that there are no MAP-A in the Tech Schools. Also, for 2008-2010 there is no MAP data for South Tech since there were no 10th or 11th grade students at South as it was transitioning from full-day to half-day only. Similarly, this section does not disaggregate for students with Limited English Proficiency as there were very few (less than 5) to no students identified depending on the year. In 2009 Missouri instituted End-of-Course (EOC) exams to replace MAP at the high school level. Because the End-of-Course exams are specific to a course rather than general assessments across an entire discipline, it is not reasonable to make one-to-one comparisons. In part this is due to the smaller numbers of students who will take EOCs. Aggregate MAP/EOC scores for Technical Education Schools are reported in Table 24.

Table 24. Technical Schools - Communication Arts and Mathematics

Content Area	Level	2008		2009		2010	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Communication Arts	LND	1	.5	0	0.0	2	2.4
	Below Basic	48	22.5	0	0.0	0	0
	Basic	137	64.3	19	26.8	20	23.8
	Proficient	25	11.7	48	67.6	57	67.9
	Advanced	2	.9	4	5.6	5	6.0
	Total	213	100.0	71	100.0	84	100.0
Mathematics	LND	1	.8	0	0.0	0	0
	Below Basic	44	37.3	4	18.2	1	7.1
	Basic	48	40.7	12	54.5	8	57.1
	Proficient	23	19.5	5	22.7	5	35.7
	Advanced	2	1.7	1	4.5	0	0
	Total	118	100.0	22	100.0	14	100.0

The above tables show that performance in Communication Arts and Mathematics has improved with the institution of the End-of-Course (EOC) examinations in 2009. The percentage of students scoring Advanced or Proficient in Communication Arts increased from 12.6% in 2008 and 73.2% in 2009 to 73.9% in English II (Sophomore English) in 2010. The percentage scoring Advanced or Proficient in Mathematics increased from 21.2% in 2008 and 27.2% in 2009 to 35.7% in Algebra in 2010. The percentage of students categorized as Level Not Determined in Communication Arts decreased from .5% in 2008 to 0% in 2009 and then increased to 2.4% in 2010. While, the percentage of students categorized as Level Not Determined in Mathematics has remained very low over the last three years, from .8% in 2008 to 0% in 2009 and then again to 0% in 2010.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Race/Ethnicity

Disaggregated MAP data based on ethnicity is reported below in Table 25 (Communication Arts) and Table 26 (Mathematics). Similar to the previous sections, disaggregated data for selected ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic) are not reported due to the fact that no students were identified in the group, or very few students (less than 10) were identified in a given year which may compromise confidentiality if reported.

Table 25. Technical Education – Communication Arts: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Black	LND	1	.5	0	0	2	2.6
		Below Basic	45	23.9	0	0	0	0
		Basic	124	66.0	19	30.6	19	24.4
		Proficient	16	8.5	43	69.4	54	69.2
		Advanced	2	1.1	0	0	3	3.8
		Total	188	100.0	62	100.0	78	100.0
	White	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	3	13.6	0	0	0	0
		Basic	12	54.5	0	0	0	0
		Proficient	7	31.8	4	80.0	3	60.0
		Advanced	0	0	1	20.0	2	40.0
		Total	22	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0

Black students showed increases in the percentage of students scoring in the Advanced or Proficient ranges with Black improving from 9.6% in 2008 to 69.4% in 2009 and then increased to 73.0% in 2010. White students also improved from 31.8% in 2008 to 100.0% in 2009 and 100.0% in 2010, with a remarkable 40% in 2010 in the “Advanced” range. Both groups showed stability in the percentages of students categorized as Level Not Determined with Black students ranging from .5% in 2008 to .0% in 2009 and then increasing 2.6% in 2010. White students likewise remained low from 0% in 2008 to 0% in both 2009 and 2010. MSIP standard 9.1.3 states that districts with students in any group that is identified statewide as a racial/ethnic minority at any grade level tested by MAP must demonstrate improvement in that minority population’s achievement which is equal to or greater than the achievement of the non-minority group. Despite the improvement in scores for both groups, the percentage of White students scoring Advanced or Proficient in Communication Arts (100.0%) was higher than the percentage of Black students in these groups. The percentage of White students in the Advanced and Proficient levels remains at (100.0%). While Black students in these groups increased to 73% in 2010.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 26. Technical Education - Mathematics: Race/Ethnicity

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Black	LND	1	.9	0	0.0	0	0
		Below Basic	43	39.8	4	23.5	1	7.7
		Basic	45	41.7	9	52.9	8	61.5
		Proficient	18	16.7	3	17.6	4	30.8
		Advanced	1	.9	1	5.9	0	0
		Total	108	100.0	17	100.0	13	100.0
	White	LND	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
		Below Basic	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0
		Basic	3	33.3	3	60.0	0	0
		Proficient	4	44.4	2	40.0	1	100.0
		Advanced	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0
		Total	9	100.0	5	100.0	1	100.0

The percentage of Black students scoring Advanced or Proficient increased from 17.6% in 2008 to 23.5% in 2009, and then to 30.8% in 2010 while the percentage of White students in these two score categories decreased from 55.5% in 2008 to 40.0% in 2009 and then increased to 100% in 2010. The percentage of Black students categorized as Level Not Determined decreased slightly from 0.9% in 2008 and then remained low at 0% in 2009 and 2010. White students have remained at 0% over the last three years. Between 2009 and 2010, for the Advanced and Proficient levels, Black students showed an increase of 7.3% while White students have increased by 60.0%. It should be noted that only one White student took the assessment in 2010, so comparison is not meaningful.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Gender

Disaggregated scores for the Technical Education Schools based on gender are reported in Table 27 (Communication Arts) and Table 28 (Mathematics).

Table 27. Technical Schools- Communication Arts: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	Female	LND	1	.8	0	0	1	1.8
		Below Basic	24	18.5	0	0	0	0
		Basic	92	70.8	12	26.7	12	21.1
		Proficient	13	10.0	31	68.9	39	68.4
		Advanced	0	0	2	4.4	5	8.8
		Total	130	100.0	45	100.0	57	100.0
	Male	LND	0	0	0	0	1	3.7
		Below Basic	24	28.9	0	0	0	0
		Basic	45	54.2	7	26.9	8	29.6
		Proficient	12	14.5	17	65.4	18	66.7
		Advanced	2	2.4	2	7.7	0	0
		Total	83	100.0	26	100.0	27	100.0

The data reported above show that in Communication Arts males and females achieved at very similar rates with females outperforming males by only 10.5% in the top two levels of Advanced and Proficient. Females showed an increase in the Advanced and Proficient levels of 3.9% from 2009 to 2010, while Males showed decrease of 6.4% in the same years. Both groups showed increase in the percentage of students categorized as Level Not Determined with Female students increasing slightly from 0% in 2009 to 1.8% in 2010. Male students increase slightly higher from 0% in 2009 to 3.7% in 2010.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 28. Technical Schools- Mathematics: Gender

Content Area	Race/Ethnicity	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	Female	LND	1	1.3	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	28	37.3	3	25.0	0	0
		Basic	34	45.3	6	50.0	5	83.3
		Proficient	11	14.7	3	25.0	1	16.7
		Advanced	1	1.3	0	0	0	0
		Total	75	100.0	12	100.0	6	100.0
	Male	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	16	37.2	1	10.0	1	12.5
		Basic	14	32.6	6	60.0	3	37.5
		Proficient	12	27.9	2	20.0	4	50.0
		Advanced	1	2.3	1	10.0	0	0
		Total	43	100.0	10	100.0	8	100.0

In Mathematics males outperformed females by 33.3%, while females slipped in the top two levels of Advanced and Proficient from 2009 to 2010 by 8.3%, however males improved by 20.0%. There was a consistency in the Level Not Determined over the three years, with 0% for both males and females in 2010.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Disability (IEP Status)

Disaggregated scores for the Technical Education Schools based on disability (IEP status) are reported in Table 29 (Communication Arts) and Table 30 (Mathematics).

Table 29. Technical Schools - Communication Arts: IEP Status

Content Area	IEP Student	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	No	LND	1	.5	0	0	2	2.6
		Below Basic	34	18.0	0	0	0	0
		Basic	128	67.7	16	24.6	15	19.5
		Proficient	24	12.7	45	69.2	57	74.0
		Advanced	2	1.1	4	6.2	3	3.9
		Total	189	100.0	65	100.0	77	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	14	58.3	0	0	0	0
		Basic	9	37.5	3	50.0	5	71.4
		Proficient	1	4.2	3	50.0	0	0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	2	28.6
		Total	24	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0

Non-IEP students improved in Communication Arts (English II) in the two upper categories of Proficient and Advanced moving from 75.4% in 2009 to 77.9% in 2010 while IEP students decreased from 50.0% in 2009 to 28.6% in 2010. The Level Not Determined remained very low and stable for IEP, while Non-IEP students increased from 0% in 2009 to 2.6% in 2010. Between 2009 and 2010, in the Advanced and Proficient levels, Non-IEP students improved by 2.5% while IEP students declined 21.4%. It should be noted that only 7 of the students taking the assessment had IEPs in 2010, so comparison is not meaningful.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 30. Technical Schools - Mathematics: IEP Status

Content Area	IEP Student	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	No	LND	1	1.0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	32	31.7	1	6.7	1	7.7
		Basic	44	43.6	9	60.0	8	61.5
		Proficient	22	21.8	4	26.7	4	30.8
		Advanced	2	2.0	1	6.7	0	0
		Total	101	100.0	15	100.0	13	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	12	70.6	3	42.9	0	0
		Basic	4	23.5	3	42.9	0	0
		Proficient	1	5.9	1	14.3	1	100.0
		Advanced	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	17	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0

Non-IEP students scoring in the Proficient and Advanced levels of Mathematics (Algebra I) decreased from 33.4% in 2009 to 30.8% in 2010 by comparison with only one IEP student, also increased from 14.3% in 2009 to 100.0% in 2010. The Level Not Determined for Non-IEP students remained very low and stable with both groups at 0% for 2010.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Socioeconomic Status (Free/Reduced Lunch)

Disaggregated scores for Technical Education Schools based on socioeconomic status (free/reduced lunch) are reported in Table 31 (Communication Arts) and Table 32 (Mathematics).

Table 31. Technical Schools – Communication Arts: Free/Reduced Lunch

Content Area	Free/Reduced Lunch	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Comm. Arts	No	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	21	24.7	0	0	0	0
		Basic	55	64.7	6	26.1	4	19.0
		Proficient	8	9.4	15	65.2	16	76.2
		Advanced	1	1.2	2	8.7	1	4.8
		Total	85	100.0	23	100.0	21	100.0
	Yes	LND	1	.8	0	0	2	3.2
		Below Basic	27	21.1	0	0	0	0
		Basic	82	64.1	13	27.1	16	25.4
		Proficient	17	13.3	33	68.8	41	65.1
		Advanced	1	.8	2	4.2	4	6.3
		Total	128	100.0	48	100.0	63	100.0

A review of performance by students receiving and not receiving free or reduced lunch shows that in Communication Arts the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced was very similar between the two groups. In addition, both groups of students exhibited overall improvement in the Advanced and Proficient levels between 2009 and 2010 with those receiving free and reduced lunch slightly declined by 1.6% and those not receiving free and reduced lunch improved by 7.1%. The percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch as Level Not Determined increase from 0% in 2009 to 3.2% in 2010 and those not receiving free and reduced lunch remained at 0% for both 2009 and 2010.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 32. Technical Education Schools – Mathematics: Free/Reduced Lunch

Content Area	Free/Reduced Lunch	Level	2008		2009		2010	
			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Mathematics	No	LND	1	2.1	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	14	29.8	3	27.3	0	0
		Basic	20	42.6	6	54.5	1	50.0
		Proficient	10	21.3	2	18.2	1	50.0
		Advanced	2	4.3	0	0	0	0
		Total	47	100.0	11	100.0	2	100.0
	Yes	LND	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Below Basic	30	42.3	1	9.1	1	8.3
		Basic	28	39.4	6	54.5	7	58.3
		Proficient	13	18.3	3	27.3	4	33.3
		Advanced	0	0	1	9.1	0	0
		Total	71	100.0	11	100.0	12	100.0

In Mathematics, students not receiving free or reduced lunch showed an increase in the top two levels of Advanced and Proficient between 2009 and 2010 from 18.2% to 50.0%. Students receiving free or reduced lunch, however, improved in the same two years from 36.4% to 33.3%. For 2010, both groups had a Level Not Determined of 0%.

Adequate Yearly Progress: Technical Education Schools

Each year, districts receive a report of Adequate Yearly Progress. This report includes each school's performance on meeting annual performance targets for achievements tests both as a total school as for each subgroup (race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, students with an IEP, and students with Limited English Proficiency). AYP data for the Technical Schools are disaggregated in similar fashion to the Special Education programs. Also, for 2010 the AYP is based solely on North Tech data as there is no EOC data for South Tech since there were no 10th or 11th grade full-day students at South Tech.

Performance on Assessments

The AYP determination is based on performance of each school's subgroup on Communication Arts and Mathematics assessments. To be included in the determination, a subgroup must include 30 students. Scores are counted only for students enrolled in the school on the last Wednesday in September, when memberships are first reported for the year. In 2010, the annual target for Communication Arts was 67.4% of students in the Proficient or Advanced range; for Mathematics the target was 63.3%. The AYP status for North Technical is reported below in Table 33 and the AYP Additional Indicator is reported in Table 34.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Table 33. Adequate Yearly Progress: 2009 Subgroup Analysis

School	Communication Arts			Mathematics			Overall Achievement Targets
	School Total	Subgroups Met	Subgroups Not Met	School Total	Subgroups Met	Subgroups Not Met	
North Technical	Met	Black F/R Lunch	NA	Met	NA	NA	Met

Table 34. AYP Additional Indicator: Technical Education

School	Additional Indicator	Indicator Met	Note
North Technical	Graduation Rate	Met	Graduation Rate Increase from 96.8% to 97.3%

Communication Arts (English II) and Mathematics (Algebra I) scores met the AYP goals for academic achievement. Two measurable sub-groups (Black students and Free & Reduced Lunch) and the School Total met the standard in Communication Arts. Since there were no measurable sub-groups for Mathematics, only the School Total was considered and it met AYP. The AYP Additional Indicator of Graduation Rate at North Tech was 97.3% which exceeded the AYP goal of 85%.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Section III. Summary and Recommendations

Special Education Schools, POS Agencies and Court Programs

Strengths

- Review of MAP and MAP-A performance shows that overall scores have increased over the last three years for students in special education schools.
- Although the percentage of students in the “Proficient” and “Advanced” categories was much higher for MAP-A students than MAP students, both groups showed improved scores.
- All five special education schools met achievement standards and other indicators for AYP. Courts programs met AYP requirement in Communication Arts.
- Gender- and ethnic achievement gaps are narrowing.
- Scores for students in POS agencies increased over the previous year.

Concerns

- The scores of students taking the MAP increased, but are still far lower than students participating in the MAP-A.
- Although achievement gaps are narrowing, they still exist.
- Students not receiving free/reduced lunch scored higher than students receiving free/reduced lunch, indicating variation by social-economic status.
- Finally, students in Courts programs without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in Communication Arts and Mathematics.

Recommendations

- Schools should analyze MAP scores to identify specific skills or areas needing extra attention in instruction. Where appropriate, targeted interventions should be provided in those areas.
- The district should continue implementation of the Communication Arts and Math curriculum guides and curriculum materials. This guides and materials are closely aligned with state standards and are designed to develop student skills, which should result in improved scores on assessments.
- Schools should continue to implement standards-based instruction and continuous formative student assessments, using data teams to analyze student performance data and modify instruction as indicated by the data. This includes adoption of a standard program to teach writing that is aligned with existing monthly writing assessments.
- Schools should continue to emphasize improving student attendance and providing students supports to meet graduation requirements, including credit recovery programs. School teams should identify specific attendance issues and interventions to address them.



GLA/EOC/MAP-A Results Disaggregated Data Review

Technical Education Schools

Strengths

- 1) Student performance meets achievement standards for AYP in all areas for North Technical School for all Disaggregated Groups in all three Academic years reviewed.
- 2) Student performance is trending in a positive direction for both Mathematics and Communication Arts. Only a single Frequency of a student scoring Below Basic in Mathematics occurred out of 14 total Frequencies. No Frequencies of a total of 82 Frequencies in Communications Arts were Below Basic.
- 3) North Technical School represents a unique opportunity for integration of Academics and Technical coursework due to the academic offerings that complement Technical Program offerings.

Concerns

- 1) Performance of selected disaggregated groups demonstrating inconsistent gains; measuring gains is complicated by the small number of students in some Disaggregated Groups.
- 2) Meeting MSIP standard 9.1.3 continues to be a concern; performance for an identified statewide minority group did not improve at the same rate as non-minority group.

Recommendations

- 1) Apply strategies that integrate STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) skills across Program Curriculum.
- 2) Technical Schools should examine the use of Post Secondary Placement assessments to measure student readiness for matriculation into post secondary institutions to positively affect Post Secondary student placement.
- 3) Revise assessment Plan to utilize KeyTrain to remediate student academic skills; KeyTrain tracks student performance level as student completes academic exercises designed to improve student performance in Math and Communication Skills. It is anticipated student performance would improve simultaneously in WorkKeys and Mathematics EOC as student complete the KeyTrain Program.

Person responsible to champion action plan: Paul Bauer
Mike Rogg

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: Annually

Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation