



## **Special School District**

### **INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS** *Special Education Schools and* *Courts Programs* **Program Evaluation**

Paul Bauer, Chair

Board Approved: April 26, 2011



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Executive Summary

As required by the Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) standards, school districts must evaluate Instructional Effectiveness biennially. The focus of the present report is: *What do student outcomes as measured by district assessments and student data indicate about instructional effectiveness?* Based on stakeholder review of objective assessment data strengths, opportunities for improvement and recommendations were noted.

### Strengths

- Nearly 75% of students have shown progress in their level of literacy.
- Both the number and rate of incidents of aggression has declined.
- The “gender gap” has narrowed slightly over the last five years.
- While overall the percentage of students showing progress fell, the ethnic “achievement gap” disappeared in the literacy assessment in 2009-2010.
- Both five-year and four-year cohorts showed increases in GLA scaled scores over time
- Comparison of students’ MAP-A scores to a similar school system showed that performance of SSD schools exceeds that of the comparison group. Comparison of GLA/EOC scores to a similar school showed the performance of the benchmark school to exceed that of 4 of 6 SSD schools in Communication Arts and 3 of 6 schools in Math.
- Formative assessment data show that between almost two-thirds and 95% of students have shown progress during the current school year.

### Opportunities for Improvement

- Overall, the percentage of students showing progress on district literacy assessments has consistently decreased over the last five year.
- The district was unable to obtain both Pre- and Post- scores for over 25% of students. This was predominantly due to student mobility in and out of their school. Less than one percent of cases were due to student refusal, inability to test, or staff error.
- Although both four- and five-year cohorts showed increases in scaled scores, scores fluctuate greatly from year to year. Terra Nova scores did not show an overall increase for the cohorts.
- Comparison of GLA and EOC scores of SSD schools and a comparable school showed the half or more of the SSD schools’ performance lagged.

### Recommendations

- Continue to identify benchmark schools. Visit or otherwise obtain programming information from those whose performance exceeds that of SSD schools.
- Continue use of quarterly assessments to measure student progress. Use the data team model to identify strengths, opportunities for improvement, and interventions for those students who do not show progress.
- Continue to provide staff training and ongoing support in implementing Classroom Learning Systems, including the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle. This is a model for increasing student learning and performance.
- Continue current efforts to review and revise curricula and to identify additional instructional materials to support teachers in implementing curricula.



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Program Evaluation Question(s)

What do student outcomes as measured by district assessments and student data indicate about instructional effectiveness?

### I. Program/Service Information

1. Name of Program or Services: Instructional Effectiveness

2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program:  
Paul Bauer, Director

3. Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s): Ackerman School  
Bridges Program  
Courts Programs  
Litzsinger School  
Neuwoehner School  
Northview School  
Southview School

Number of staff: 183 Teachers, 255 Paraprofessionals

Participants: Approximately 900 students, Ages 5-21

Length of program/service: This report includes literacy assessment data for each school year since 2005-2006 and behavior data since 2005-2006.

4. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):  
March 2011

5. Goal/Objective of Program/Services:  
Develop and enhance quality educational/instructional programs to improve performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic and career goals.

6. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:  
MSIP Standard 6.2.1 requires that districts use a variety of assessment data (e.g., longitudinal, demographic, disaggregated, diagnostic, surveys, etc.) to support district wide decisions about curriculum and instruction. MSIP Standard 8.1 requires that school districts evaluate instructional effectiveness at least biennially. CSIP Objective 1.1 states that the district will “Annually meet state criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in SSD schools/sites for all subgroups for all content areas. Objective 1.2 is that the district will annually meet state criteria for post-secondary outcomes.



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

Evaluation question:

1. Are students showing academic progress?

### II. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered

Literacy Assessment Continuum

Physical Aggression Data

GLA and MAP-A Performance Data

Orchard, BLFSC, API, and WriteSource formative data

### III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Name	Role
Paul Bauer	Chair
Chris Baldwin	Program Evaluation
Phyllis Kulp	Federal Programs
Marsha Myers	Administrator
Chuck Howard	Principal
Lorie Arnsman Schwartz	Principal
Kelly Grigsby	Principal
Stephanie Valleroy	Principal
Wendi Pendergrass	Principal
Lori White	Principal
Dan Kelly	Principal

### IV. Results

#### Literacy Assessment

Each year, staff administer the district’s continuum of literacy assessments. This continuum consists of the Basic Literacy Foundational Skills Checklist, (BLFSC), the Beginning Reading Test (BRT), and the STAR Reading assessment. In addition, the district uses the assessments, Development Reading Assessment (DRA) and Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) as alternatives to the STAR. Each student’s teacher chooses a specific assessment for that student based upon the student’s current literacy skills. A student is determined to have made progress if (a) the student participates in a given assessment at one level then participates in the next higher assessment or (b) the student achieves a higher score on the same assessment. Teachers administer the literacy assessments during two windows during the school year, each about two weeks long: one window is in August, the other from late April to early May. As of the 2010-2011 school year, students entering school after the August window or exiting before the May window are tested upon entry or exit. This is done to help ensure that all students get some measure to determine their level of literacy and progress, even if not for the full school year. Literacy Assessment results are presented in Table 1 (District Total), Table 2 (Totals by Gender), and Table 3 (Totals by Ethnicity).



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

Table 1. District Literacy Assessment Data

Year	Total Students	Students w/ Pre and Post	Pre/Post Students Progressed	Percent Progressed	
				Pre/Post Group	Total Students
05-06	740	577	499	86%	67%
06-07	762	584	486	83%	64%
07-08	766	568	460	81%	60%
08-09	839	647	524	81%	62%
09-10	807	588	435	74%	54%

Table 1 shows scores of students taking both pre- and post-tests. It indicates that 74% of students who participated in both the pre and post test during 2009-2010 showed progress in literacy skills. These students represent 54% of all students enrolled. This percentage has declined over the last five years. It is important to note that not all students participate in both the pre- and post-test. As shown above, student progress was not determined for 219 students during the 2009-2010 school year. Thus, the district was unable to determine progress for about 25% of the students in special education schools. This lack of data has been remedied with changes in the assessment schedule implemented during the current school year.

Reasons for not having both scores are listed below:

Reason	Student Count
Enrolled at start of year, but exited before first testing window	15
Enrolled for first test window, exited before second window	76
Entered after first testing window	92
Entered after first testing window, exited before second window	17
Deceased	2
Absent	7
Unable to test	2
Refused to participate	4
Graduated at end of 1 <sup>st</sup> semester	2
Higher level of test given in fall, lower level given in spring	2
Total	219



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

Table 2. District Literacy Assessment Data by Gender

Year	Gender	Total Students	Students w/ Pre and Post	Pre/Post Students Progressed	Percent Progressed	
					Pre/Post Group	Total Students
05-06	Male	529	400	354	89%	67%
	Female	211	177	145	82%	69%
06-07	Male	533	414	350	85%	66%
	Female	229	170	136	80%	59%
07-08	Male	537	399	330	83%	61%
	Female	229	169	130	77%	57%
08-09	Male	600	447	359	80%	60%
	Female	239	200	165	83%	69%
09-10	Male	576	422	316	75%	55%
	Female	231	166	120	72%	52%

Table 2. shows that, except for 2008-2009, a greater percentage of males taking both the pre- and post-test showed progress than females. Except for 2008-2009, the percentage of females showing progress has decreased each year. The same pattern of decreasing percentage showing progress holds true for males also.



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

Table 3. District Literacy Assessment Data by Ethnicity

Year	Ethnicity	Total Students	Students w/ Pre and Post	Students Progressed	Percent Progressed	
					Pre/Post Group	Total
05-06	Asian	11	9	8	89%	73%
	Black	414	309	265	86%	64%
	Hispanic	7	7	6	86%	86%
	White	308	252	220	87%	71%
06-07	Asian	9	9	7	78%	78%
	Black	421	303	250	83%	59%
	Hispanic	6	4	4	100%	67%
	Am. Indian	1	1	1	100%	100%
	White	325	267	224	84%	69%
07-08	Asian	9	8	7	88%	78%
	Black	399	291	234	80%	59%
	Hispanic	7	4	3	75%	43%
	Am. Indian	1	1	1	100%	100%
	White	350	264	215	81%	61%
08-09	Asian	8	7	7	100%	88%
	Black	417	309	246	80%	59%
	Hispanic	8	7	7	100%	88%
	Am. Indian	1	1	1	100%	100%
	White	405	323	263	81%	65%
09-10	Asian	8	6	5	83%	63%
	Black	378	270	199	74%	53%
	Hispanic	10	7	4	74%	40%
	Am. Indian	1	1	1	100%	100%
	White	410	304	226	74%	55%

Table 3 shows that, for both Black and White students, the percentage of students showing progress has declined since 2005-2006. In each year except 2009-2010, the percentage of White students showing progress has been slightly higher than that of Black students; in 2009-2010, the percentage was the same. Despite these declines it should be noted that in all groups, more than 70% of students showed improvement, and, until 2009-2010, all but Asian students in 2006-2007 and Hispanic students in 2007-2008 showed 80% or more of students showing progress. It can therefore be stated that, while the percentage of students showing progress has declined somewhat, literacy programs are effective in improving literacy for a large majority of students.

#### Physical Aggression towards Peers/Adults

Special Education Schools and Courts Programs collect quarterly data to determine the average incidence rate of physical aggression towards staff and students. The incidence rate is calculated



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

by dividing the total number of incidences of physical aggression towards staff and students at each site and dividing it by the total number of students present. Physical aggression towards staff and students is defined as a physical assault, such as hitting, biting, or kicking a staff person or another student. Schools monitor the data and progress and adjust their programs in order to meet the goals set for SSD’s Title IV Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities.

Table 7. District Physical Aggression Data

Year	Total Students	Aggressive Incidents	Incident Rate
05-06	1079	2403	2.23
06-07	1730	1908	1.10
07-08	1721	1487	0.86
08-09	1687	1256	0.75
09-10	1584	1019	0.64

*Note: Addition of Lakeside and JDC in 06-07*

The data in Table 7 show that over the last five years, the number of incidents of physical aggression has decreased by over half. The decline of aggressive incidents over the period is statistically significant at  $p < .01$ . The rate of such incidents has decreased by over 70%. These decreases show the effectiveness of schools in addressing student behavior. They may be attributed in part to the integration of character development into classroom instruction starting in 2006-07, the sensory and behavioral supports available to each student, and to each school’s having a data team. Character development teaches students a foundation of performance and moral character traits which affect daily actions. Data teams provide a format for careful analysis of each student’s behavior, setting goals for students, generating interventions, and studying data to show the effectiveness of the interventions. Sensory and behavioral supports provide students instruction and reinforcement of effective techniques to manage their own behavior

### Formative Assessments

Students in special education schools participate in ongoing assessment of skills in reading, writing, and math. Students who take the Grade Level Assessments (GLAs) or End of Course Exams (EOCs) use two assessments: (1) Orchard assessments in Math and Reading are computerized, based upon standards tested in the GLAs or EOCs, and generate practice activities in specific skills needing remediation. (2) The WriteSource writing assessment is part of the WriteSource program for writing instruction, and measures elements of writing and editing/proofing skills. Students who participate in the MAP-A participate in the Basic Literacy Foundational Skills Checklist and an assessment of selected Alternate Performance Indicators for Math. Students complete these assessments in late August or early September as a baseline measure and quarterly thereafter. A summary of student performance on these assessments follows. The summary shows the number and percentage of students who scored higher on their





# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

third-quarter assessment than the scored on the baseline assessment. It includes only scores for students who participated in both the baseline and third quarter assessments.

Table 8: Rate of Improvement Over Baseline: Formative Assessments

<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Number Of Students</u>	<u>Number Showing Improvement</u>	<u>Percentage Showing Improvement</u>
BLFSC (Map-A)	570	486	85.26
Math APIs (Map-A)	574	480	83.62
WriteSource			
Elements of Writing	148	98	66.22
Proofing and Editing	148	87	58.78
Orchard			
Math	93	67	72.04
Reading	100	65	65.00

The above table shows that the instruction teachers are providing students is effective in improving performance. This is especially the case for the BLFSC and the Math APIs. The students taking these two tests are evaluated with the Map-A alternative test. While the percentage of students showing progress in the Orchard or WriteSource assessments is not as high as for the BLFSC and Math APIs, the majority of students showed progress.

### GLA Cohort Data

One measure of instructional effectiveness is a review of cohort data. In such a review, a group of students is identified and the performance of that group is tracked over time. This allows an evaluation of instructional effectiveness for students who participated in instruction over time and disregards data about students who entered or exited the program during that time span. To perform that review, the scaled scores and Terra Nova of students who took the MAP/GLA five years ago (2006) and in each of the subsequent years (2007 – 2010) were reviewed.

It should be cautioned that the number of students in each cohort group is very small. As a result, differences from year-to-year are subject to variation as a result of individual student performance. Principals report that students who perform best on state and local assessments are typically those whose placement changes from a separate school to a less restrictive placement, while those remaining are typically the low-scoring students. Despite that, the data for both Communication Arts and Mathematics appear to indicate that instruction is effective and that student performance improves over time.



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

The table below shows cohort data for Communication Arts. In other words, seven fourth-graders who took the test in 2006 also took it in 2007 as fifth-graders. Of those seven fifth-graders, five took the test the follow year, and so on. The Scaled Score reflects the student’s performance on all items of the MAP/GLA, while the Terra Nova reflects only performance on selected response items. These data show that despite year-to-year variations over the five years, the average scaled score in 2010 was higher than the average in 2006. This was not the case with Terra Nova scores – this may be because, while the scaled score is criterion-referenced, the Terra Nova score is norm-referenced. Thus, students could show improvement against criteria via the scaled score, while their performance compared to other students in their grade lagged, resulting in a lower Terra Nova score.

**Five-Year Cohorts  
MAP/GLA  
Communication Arts**

Test Year	Grade	No. of Students	Average Scaled Score	Average Terra Nova Score
2006	4	7	523.43	9.43
2007	5	7	548.71	8.29
2008	6	5	610.20	22.20
2009	7	4	548.00	6.00
2010	8	3	587.33	3.67

---

2006	3	6	560.33	18.17
2007	4	6	581.83	22.33
2008	5	6	569.67	12.33
2009	6	2	639.50	37.00
2010	7	1	573.00	9.00

As noted above, this table demonstrates the difficulty associated with the extremely small sample size. Year to year comparison are greatly affected by individual scores.

The following table shows five-year cohort data for Mathematics. Unlike Communication Arts, the average scaled score for this group increased each year (except Grades 4 and 5 in 2007-08). In addition, despite variation from year-to-year, the average Terra Nova score for the grade 4-8 cohort for 2010 was higher than for 2006.



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Five-Year Cohorts MAP/GLA Mathematics

Year of Test	Grade	No. of Students	Average Scaled Score	Average Terra Nova Score
2006	4	7	534.14	7.29
2007	5	7	555.71	6.57
2008	6	5	572.20	21.00
2009	7	4	604.25	14.00
2010	8	3	632.00	10.00

---

2006	3	6	548.14	20.29
2007	4	6	541.57	12.29
2008	5	6	529.57	8.00
2009	6	2	574.50	21.00
2010	7	1	601.00	10.00

Analysis of four-year cohorts was also completed. In Communication Arts, the cohort consisting of students in Grades 4 – 7 in 2007-08 showed a decrease in both scaled scores and Terra Nova scores over time. The Grade 5 – 7 cohort over that time span showed variation in scaled scores, but a higher score in 2010 than in 2007. Terra Nova scores decreased. Following are four-year cohort scores in Communication Arts.

### Cohort Scores 2007-2010 Communication Arts

Year of Test	Grade	No. of Students	Average Scaled Score	Average Terra Nova Score
2007	4	9	588.00	23.00
2008	5	9	581.78	20.33
2009	6	3	641.33	38.67
2010	7	2	581.00	5.00



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Cohort Scores 2007-2010 Communication Arts

Year of Test	Grade	No. of Students	Average Scaled Score	Average Terra Nova Score
2007	5	10	572.00	23.10
2008	6	9	625.67	33.44
2009	7	8	599.38	15.75
2010	8	7	613.71	21.29

In contrast with Communication Arts, students in each of the four-year Math cohorts showed growth over the four years. This is shown in the tables below.

### Cohort Scores 2007-2010 Mathematics

Year of Test	Grade	No. of Students	Average Scaled Score	Average Terra Nova Score
2007	4	9	556.00	17.44
2008	5	9	556.33	21.56
2009	6	3	596.67	25.00
2010	7	2	612.50	16.50

### Cohort Scores 2007-2010 Mathematics

Year of Test	Grade	No. of Students	Average Scaled Score	Average Terra Nova Score
2007	5	10	580.50	18.80
2008	6	8	605.13	32.50
2009	7	8	615.25	23.50
2010	8	7	644.00	28.86



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

These data show that in Mathematics, students in both four-year cohorts showed increased scaled scores over time. As elsewhere, these students' average scaled scores increased consistently, while their Terra Nova scores did not.

As can be seen above, in spite of the difficulties with small sample size and a highly mobile population, the data indicates that in both Communication Arts and Mathematics instruction is effective and student performance improves over time.

### Benchmark Comparisons

One component of a continuous improvement model is to compare district performance to the performance of similar schools. The following schools were identified for comparison:

a. Park Hill Day School – This public separate special education school is in the Park Hill School District. In 2009-2010 it enrolled 51 K-12 students with Emotional Disturbance (ED). The GLA/EOC performance of these students as a group was compared to the GLA/EOC performance of students with ED in the SSD special education schools.

b. Missouri State Schools for the Severely Disabled – In 2009-2010 these public separate special education schools enrolled 962 students with Intellectual Disabilities, Vision Impairment, Hearing Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Multiple Disabilities, Autism, and Traumatic Brain Injury. All of the students participate in the MAP-A. The MAP-A performance of these students was compared to students in the SSD special education schools who participated in the MAP-A.

**State Assessments  
GLA/EOC Comparison  
Benchmark Schools  
Percentage Proficient/Advanced**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Students Comm Arts</b>	<b>Percent Proficient/ Advanced</b>	<b>Number of Students Math</b>	<b>Percent Proficient/ Advanced</b>
Park Hill Day	17	35.29	18	16.67
Ackerman	28	32.14	28	32.14
Bridges	4	0.00	4	0.00
Neuwoehner	5	0.00	9	0.00
Litzsinger	22	18.18	22	18.18
Northview	8	25.00	5	0.00
Southview	15	33.33	11	45.26



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

State Assessments  
MAP-A Comparison  
Benchmark Schools  
Percentage Proficient/Advanced

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of Students Comm Arts</b>	<b>Percent Proficient/ Advanced</b>	<b>Number of Students Math</b>	<b>Percent Proficient/ Advanced</b>
State Schools	428	75.00	443	82.22
Ackerman	67	92.54	67	92.54
Neuwoehner	18	100.00	23	100.00
Litzsinger	78	93.59	78	96.15
Northview	26	100.00	22	100.00
Southview	62	90.32	52	100.00

The above comparisons show that the performance of SSD schools on the Communication Arts GLA/EOC lags behind that of the comparison school. Only two of the six SSD schools showed roughly comparable performance in this area. In Math, three of six schools surpassed performance of the comparison school, while three were far behind. The comparison of MAP-A results showed that the performance of SSD schools far surpasses that of their comparison schools enrolling only students who participate in the MAP-A.

### Review of Progress on Recommendations from Last Program Evaluation

1. *SSD should expand its efforts for improving students' levels of literacy. These include development of Communication Arts curricula that ensure literacy performance standards and competencies are fully addressed, improvement of instruction to use instructional strategies shown to improve student performance and to close the achievement gap between ethnic groups, and adoption of common texts and materials that are aligned with the curriculum. Curricula should contain formative assessments based on Show-Me Standards and Grade Level/Course Level Expectations as well as on Alternate Performance Indicators and be aligned with those standards, expectations, and indicators.*

**Status:** In 2009 the Board approved a K-12 Communication Arts curriculum that was aligned with DESE standards, GLEs, and CLEs. In 2010 the Board approved a Communication Arts curriculum extension based upon Alternate Grade Level Expectations for students who participate in the MAP-A. During the 2009-2010 school year, the district adopted textbook series and materials for students grades K-12 that are aligned with the



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

curriculum. The textbook vendor provided teachers professional development to use the textbooks and materials. The textbooks and materials are currently being implemented and contain classroom assessments to measure students' mastery of the content.

2. *Staff in special education schools and courts programs have begun implementing continuous improvement programs to attain a high level of quality in instruction. Actions to fully implement these processes should continue. One key part of the continuous improvement process is systematic formative data collection, review and analysis of data. Schools utilize professional learning communities and data teams – staff should continue to develop their skills in these processes.*

**Status:** All classroom teachers in special education schools and courts have been trained to implement Classroom Learning Systems and high-yield instructional strategies. This includes use of the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) process to monitor student performance and mastery of content as well as instructional strategies based upon input from students. Each school has a leadership team, goal teams, and data teams that meet regularly, review data on student performance, and generate strategies to improve student learning.

3. *SSD schools should continue to implement PBIS programs integrated with character development programs and continue to develop services provided to parents and students to continue the pattern of decreases in incidents of aggression by students.*

**Status:** The special education schools and courts program participate in SSD's PBIS program. In addition, staff at each school have participated in professional development in character education. Schools have met with district staff about integrating character education and PBIS and are implementing processes to do so.

4. *SSD should refine its system of continuous formative assessment to measure student growth in academic skills. The Orchard system is currently being used for this purpose, as well as a locally-developed formative assessment of growth in demonstration of Alternate Performance Indicators for students taking the MAP-A. Staff should focus on developing these assessments and focus instruction on student performance areas shown as needing improvement. The current system of measuring student skills and progress relies on testing windows once or twice per year, and students who are not in school during those windows have no scores. A system of continuous assessment by which students are tested upon entry and throughout the year would enable schools to obtain data on student performance despite students' being absent or not enrolled at certain times throughout the year. Furthermore, the number of students for whom scores could not be obtained indicates that the tests currently used may not be appropriate for those students. Therefore, the district should investigate and adopt achievement tests that measure achievement and progress of all students.*

**Status:** In 2010 the Board approved SSD's assessment plan for the 2010-2011 school year. The plan included (a) Orchard Reading and Math assessments based on GLAs and EOCs to be given



# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

five times yearly, (b) an assessment that is part of the WriteSource writing program, which students take five times yearly, along with an assessment using a writing prompt in months when the WriteSource assessment is not given, (c) the BLFSC, a district-wide common assessment of reading skills for students who participate in the MAP-A, and (d) a student assessment, given five times per year, of Math APIs based on the MAP-A. In addition, the district literacy assessment schedule was adjusted so that students entering or leaving their school after the beginning or before the end of the year are assessed upon entry and exit. The combination of assessments and their times of administration enable teachers and data teams to analyze student performance in a timely manner.

### **V. Discussion**

#### Strengths

- Though rates have declined somewhat in recent years, nearly 75% of students have shown progress in their level of literacy.
- Both the number and rate of incidents of aggression has declined drastically over the past 5 years.
- The “gender gap” has narrowed slightly over the last five years. While overall the percentage of students showing progress fell, the ethnic “achievement gap” disappeared in the literacy assessment in 2009-2010.
- Both five-year and four-year cohorts showed overall increases in GLA scaled scores over time
- Comparison of students’ MAP-A scores to a similar school system showed that performance of SSD schools on this assessment exceeds that of the comparison group. Comparison of GLA/EOC scores to a similar school showed the performance of the benchmark school to exceed that of 4 of 6 SSD schools in Communication Arts and 3 of 6 schools in Math.
- Formative assessment data show that between almost two-thirds and 95% of students have shown progress during the current school year.

#### Opportunities for Improvement

- Overall, the percentage of students showing progress on district literacy assessments has consistently decreased over the last five year.
- The district was unable to obtain both Pre- and Post- scores for over 25% of students. However, analysis shows that this was predominantly due to student mobility in and out of their school. Less than one percent of cases were due to student refusal, inability to test, or staff error.
- Although both four- and five-year cohorts showed increases in scaled scores, scores fluctuate greatly from year to year. Terra Nova scores did not show an overall increase for the cohorts. An alternative method of analyzing student progress over time should be investigated.
- Comparison of GLA and EOC scores of SSD schools and a comparable school showed the half or more of the SSD schools’ performance lagged.





# INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

## *Special Education Schools and Courts Programs*

# Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Recommendations

1. Continue to identify benchmark schools. Visit or otherwise obtain programming information from those whose performance exceeds that of SSD schools.
2. Continue use of quarterly assessments to measure student progress. Use the data team model to identify strengths, opportunities for improvement, and interventions for those students who do not show progress.
3. Continue to provide staff training and ongoing support in implementing Classroom Learning Systems, including the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle. This is a model for increasing student learning and performance.
4. Continue current efforts to review and revise curricula and to identify additional instructional materials to support teachers in implementing curricula.
5. Investigate an alternative method for analyzing student progress over time.