

**Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)
Assessment and Accountability in the Fifty States: 1999-2000**

MISSOURI

This profile was verified by the staff of the Missouri Department of Education in May 2000. All information was current as of that date.

Index:

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

Performance Standards

Reporting Performance Data

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

1. Provide a brief overview and history of the assessment system as the context.

Missouri is now implementing a performance-based assessment system for use by all public schools in the state, as required by the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993. The assessment system is designed to measure student progress toward meeting the Show-Me Standards, 73 rigorous academic standards that were adopted by the State Board of Education in January 1996.

2. What are the characteristics of the state assessment system, including:

- *Name of Assessment Instrument(s) or Program(s)* The Missouri Assessment Program (MAP), is phasing out the Missouri Mastery and Achievement Tests (MMAT). Missouri also administers the TerraNova Survey as part of the MAP tests.
- *Grade Levels and Subjects Tested*

Mathematics	4, 8, 10
Communication Arts	3, 7, 11
Science	3, 7, 10
Social Studies	4, 8, 11
Health/Physical Ed	5, 9
Fine Arts	5

- *Norm or Criterion Referenced Both*
- *Matrix or Census Testing Census*
- *Item Types (including proportions if available via Internet or interview) such as: traditional or enhanced multiple choice, performance tasks, open-ended questions, portfolios, essays, etc. Multiple-choice, short-answer, and performance events.*
- *Time of Testing (specific month(s) or testing window):* There is a five week window in the spring, generally April – May.
- *High School Exit Exam (date of implementation and/or phase-in timeline)* Missouri does not have a high school exit exam.
- *Other Assessments:* NAEP
- *Transitional or Final Assessment System* In the process of implementing final assessment system.

3. *Who designed and produced the assessment(s) used by the state?*

- *State Department of Education*
- *Commercial Testing Organization*
- *State teachers and administrators*
- *Assessment Committee*
- *Other*

If a commercial test was used by the state, were modifications or additions made to the assessment to address state requirements or standards? If so, what did they include?

Technical work on the MAP is handled by the Missouri Department of Education and Secondary Education (DESE) and CTB/McGraw-Hill, the testing company serving as contractor for the MAP program. Items are written by Missouri teachers and staff from CTB, piloted in Missouri, and reviewed and accepted or rejected by an ad hoc committee of Missouri teachers. The Commission on Performance, headed by the governor, major legislative leaders, representatives from educational organization, and private citizens, was established by the Outstanding Schools Act to advise the State Board on the validity and reliability of the assessments developed for the MAP program.

4. *What are the state requirements for local assessment, including the types of assessments and their use in areas such as reporting and accountability, as well as Title I adequate yearly progress? What grade levels and subjects are tested?*

Certain process standards that are important for each of the subject areas do not lend themselves to assessment on a statewide, on-demand test of the nature of the MAP. Districts are required to have a plan for assessing such standards. The MSIP program will simply check to make sure certain plans exist; districts are free to determine the details of their plans. The plans districts develop and implement should adequately address the standards in ways that the district finds to be practicable.

Evidence of a local assessment program is also part of the state accreditation system.

5. *Is the state assessment system aligned with the state standards? Are there plans for alignment, and if so, how will the assessment and standards become aligned?*

- *Refining standards* By November 1997, districts must have cross referenced at least one curricular area to the Show-Me Standards and must have a written plan to complete the cross referencing of all curricular areas by June 30, 2001.
- *Revamping assessments* Missouri is developing new performance assessments to be aligned with the Missouri “Show-Me Standards.” Districts still write their own curriculum, which are to be aligned with the Show-Me Standards.
- *Adding components to assessments*
What is the timeline for completion of the alignment?

6. *What is the state’s approach for ensuring alignment and what evidence of that alignment is provided?*

The MSIP Standards and Indicators include curriculum standards that require the local, written curriculum to be cross-referenced to the Show-Me Standards. Moreover, as an example of a local strategy for improving achievement, the state guidelines suggest: the district will review all curriculum guides and revise them to assure that there is clear alignment between the skills tested and the skills taught at each grade level.

7. *How is the data included in the state assessment system used?*

- *Student Grade Promotion/Retention, Graduation, Diploma Certification* Not specifically.
- *Teacher, School and/or District accountability* The MAP will be used in accrediting school districts. Falling scores could result in a district’s accreditation not being met and they could also contribute to a building being identified as and “academically deficient” building.
- *Program Evaluation (Identify federal, state programs)* Title I evaluation
- *Identification of students for programs like Title I, state CompEd, Bilingual, etc.*
- *Instructional guidance to local administrators and/or teachers* The state assessment data is used for this purpose.
- *School improvement (e.g., preparing a school improvement plan)* The state assessment data is used for this purpose.

8. *Are there changes planned for the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

The MAP assessment system is being phased in according to the following timeline:

Subject	Field Test	Assessment Available	Required
Math	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	1998
Communication Arts	Fall 1997	Spring 1998	1999
Science	Fall 1997	Spring 1998	1999
Social Studies	Fall 1998	Spring 1999	2000
Health/Physical Educ	Fall 1999	Spring 2000	2001
Fine Arts	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	2002

MAP-Alternate	Spring 1999 (pilot)	1999-2000 year	2000-2001 school year
---------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of state assessment? Explain.*

One of the major challenges Missouri will face in the near future will be the implementation of a new cycle of accreditation standards in which test results will play an important role. Districts and schools will have to meet performance standards to retain accreditation and building this capacity will be a challenge for the state.

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

1. *What exclusions are made in the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP? Who makes the decision about exclusion of a particular child? Does the state collect data or in other ways monitor the number and types of students excluded? Does that vary by test?*

State Policy Guidelines require that decisions regarding participation and accommodations be made annually, based on a student's instructional goals, curriculum, current level of functioning, skills, and learning characteristics. The student's IEP team decides how a student with disabilities participates in the assessment system. Missouri offers the following key points to consider when making participation considerations:

- Decision-makers should start from the premise that all students, including those with disabilities, will participate in the state assessment program, and to the greatest extent possible in the MAP subject area assessments.
- Any decisions regarding participation in the state assessment program must be made by a student's IEP team, and documented in the IEP along with the reasons for those decisions.
- Decisions about how a student should participate in the MAP should be based on the goals and content of that student's instruction.
- A student with disabilities should participate in all MAP subject area assessments that are instructionally relevant for that student. Decisions must be made independently for each subject area.
- Decisions about participation should never be based on program setting, category of disability, or percent of time in the regular classroom. A student should be included in any MAP subject area assessment for which that student receives instruction, regardless of where that instruction occurs.
- Students should not be exempted from any part of the MAP subject area assessment simply because they are not expected to do well.
- Districts should develop guidelines to direct decisions regarding the participation of students with disabilities in the state assessment program.
- It is important to remember that things change, so participation decisions should be reviewed just prior to assessment to be sure that they are still valid.

2. *What accommodations and/or modifications are made on the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP?*

Accommodations are changes in assessment materials or procedures that make it possible for students with disabilities to participate in an assessment. The goal in using accommodations is to give students with disabilities an equal opportunity in assessment, not to give these students an unfair advantage over other students.

Types of Accommodations may include:

- Setting Accommodations: Administering the MAP in a small group or individually, placing the student in a study carrel for testing, or providing specialized lighting.
- Timing or Scheduling Accommodations: Providing extra time for the student to complete all or part of the MAP subject area assessments, administering the MAP subject area assessments immediately after the student has taken medication that might affect test performance, providing frequent breaks during testing, changing the order of the administration to reflect students' individual learning characteristics
- Accommodations in Method of Administration or Presentation of Materials: Reading written directions aloud or repeating directions more than once, reading items to the student, using larger print, including fewer items per page, providing a calculator, tape recording directions or items, providing magnification devices, including only the items appropriate for the student's instructional program.
- Accommodations in Method of Response: Allowing students to dictate responses to a scribe or into a tape recorder, allowing students to mark directly in the test booklet, rather than on the answer sheet, allowing students to use a Braille, allowing students to write responses on lined paper.
- Other accommodations: out-of-level testing (not allowed for the MAP subject area assessments), motivational accommodations (acceptable for the MAP subject area assessments)

3. *Does the state provide assessments in languages other than English? If so, describe. In what grades and subjects?*

Missouri does not offer assessments in languages other than English

4. *Does the state provide alternative assessments for students with disabilities? If so, describe. For which students and in which subjects and at what ages?*

A very small number of students with significant disabilities will not be able to participate in the MAP subject area assessments even with accommodations. These students will participate in the alternate assessment. The alternate assessment will provide students with a different way to demonstrate their learning.

The Missouri Assessment Program – Alternate (MAP-A) will be a portfolio reflecting both the student's performance and the system supports received by the student. Documentation will be collected throughout the school year and submitted for scoring in June. A pilot was conducted Spring of 1999 to examine the MAP-A process and scoring criteria. Based upon the pilot, state regulations will be made and training will take place in the Fall for the 2000 voluntary administration.

For the pilot:

Portfolio entries are based on the student's identified IEP Goals/Objectives and can include:

- the student's IEP
- work samples
- interviews with the student or with others familiar with the student
- photos
- the student's schedule or resume
- data charts on the student's performance
- anecdotal notes
- developmental checklists
- progress reports

The system's support evaluation component will require demonstration of:

- opportunities for interactions with non-disabled peers
- opportunity to perform skills in multiple settings
- the student's access to adaptations, modifications, natural supports and/or assistive technology
- student's self-evaluation and monitoring of their progress
- use of age appropriate activities and materials, and
- incorporation of the Show-Me performance/process standards

5. Does the state have a goal for the inclusion of students with disabilities and/or LEP students on the statewide tests? Does the state use any strategies to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities? LEP students?

Missouri is moving toward an inclusive state assessment program. Beginning in the 1999-2000 school year, each district will be accountable for the assessment of all students enrolled in the district, including those receiving special education services, regardless of disability type or severity. Missouri anticipates that approximately 1 to 2 percent of students will be eligible for the MAP-A assessment. As they phase in this program, Missouri allows up to 10% of students to be exempted. If a district goes over that proportion, all of their scores are disqualified.

6. Are changes planned in the for the inclusion of SWD and LEP students in the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?

Missouri is phasing in alternate assessment.

Performance Standards

1. How many and what performance levels has the state established for its assessments?

Student performance on MAP will be summarized by these categories: Advanced, Proficient, Nearing Proficiency, Basic, and Step 1. Each level includes a specific range of numerical scores

that will determine students' ratings. The achievement levels were recommended by a group of 45 parents, educators, legislators, and business people who worked with state officials to identify what students should be expected to know, for each subject and each grade level.

2. Has the state set acceptable levels or targets for schools, districts or the state on tests, drop-out rates or other measures?

- *Target level*
- *Percentage of students expected to attain target level*
- *Time period in which to attain level*
- *Annual increase required*

As part of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Missouri has set Performance Standards, which fall into the categories of: General Academic Achievement, Reading Achievement, Career Preparation, and Educational Persistence.

In general, Missouri requires that districts:

- Increase the percentage of students in the upper two performance levels by 3%
- Decrease the percentage of students in the lower two performance levels by 3%
- Must not exceed a maximum allowed percentage of students in the lowest level. This percent varies by grade and subject.

For further information on these academic goals, please refer to the section on accountability.

3. How are these performance standards calculated? What data are included in the calculations, and at what proportions (e.g. assessment results 60%, dropout and attendance rates 40%). How are the calculations made? What is the final unit of analysis for reporting school and district achievement levels (e.g. performance index, grade, category)?

The performance standards outlined in question #1 are based on assessment data.

4. Are all students, schools and districts included in these performance calculations? If not, who is excluded?

These standards are intended to be all inclusive, very few students are excluded – only those who will take the alternate test.

5. Are changes planned for the state performance standards (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?

Missouri is phasing in performance levels associated with the MAP program. No other changes are currently anticipated.

6. What proportion of schools and/or districts fail to meet acceptable levels on performance targets?

Most recently, the Kansas City school system was denied accreditation, effective May 1, 2000. Currently, Kansas City is the only unaccredited district.

Reporting Performance Data

1. Describe the characteristics of the state performance data reporting system (by whom, what data, who is the audience) for each of the following levels:

- *Student reports*

Individual reports are generated for students by the state.

- *School reports*

State guidelines require districts to produce reports that permit the disclosure of data on a school-by-school basis. The reporting emphasis is on the district level, however, as MSIP focuses on the district, rather than the school.

- *District reports*

According to the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 (Sections 160.522 and 161.092 of state law), and under a regulation adopted by the State Board of Education in July 1995, Missouri school districts are required to publish an “annual report” for their communities.

State guidelines call for the inclusion of the following information:

- Enrollment
- Rates of pupil attendance
- High school dropout rate
- Staffing ratios
- Average years of experience of professional staff
- Advanced degree earned
- Student achievement as determined through the currently used state assessment system
- Average teacher’s salary
- Average administrator’s salary
- Average salaries of noncertified personnel compared to state averages
- Average per pupil expenditures for the district as a whole
- Average per pupil expenditures for each building in the district
- Voted tax rates
- Adjusted tax rates
- Assessed valuation
- Percent of the district’s operating budget received from state, federal, and local levels
- Extracurricular activities offered
- Costs associated with each extracurricular activities
- Number of students eligible for free and reduced lunch
- School calendar information
- Data on course offerings
- Rates of participation in various programs (special education, early childhood, vocation, gifted/enriched, etc.)

- Number of students continuing education in post-secondary programs
- Information on job placement for vocational students
- The district's most recent accreditation
- Achievement data including ACT and SAT data reported in a way that is meaningful and relevant to the local school district using: at least one comparison of district average with state average or district average with districts having a similar characteristics or characteristics using the same variables for three consecutive years; no less than a three-year history of district scores.

District profiles on the web include: demographics, educational resources, educational process data, and educational performance data. The latter category consists of: district accreditation, attendance rate, dropouts, graduation rates, graduation analysis, ACT scores, MAP math data, MAP communication arts data, MAP MSIP reading score, MAP science data, MAP social studies data, MMAT median mastery, MMAT math quintile data, MMAT reading quintile data, MMAT science quintile data, MMAT social studies quintile data.

- *State reports*

State data on the web includes: MAP scores in math, science, communication arts, social studies at all grades tested, by proficiency level. Included on web, as appendix to report on minority achievement: MAP math scores at grades 4, 8, and 10, disaggregated by race/ethnic group. The state data is searchable (on the web) by district, year (as early as 1994), data element, and comparison group (Missouri total, same enrollment size, SES, and same minority enrollment)

- *Title I reports*

The Missouri Title I office produces a report that is part of the required Consolidated Report for the US Dept of Education. They also produce an Adequate Yearly Progress report for Missouri districts and buildings.

2. *How are the data distributed? When during the year (month or time period after assessment)? To whom (students, teachers, parents, the media, the community)?*

State law requires a district annual report to be distributed to all media outlets serving the district and to be made available to all district patrons and to each member of the General Assembly representing a legislative district which contains a portion of the school district.

The state sends assessment data to local school districts in hard copy and on a CD ROM in August/September following the spring test.

3. *At what level(s) are data disaggregated (state, district and school levels)? For what groups are disaggregated data reported (see Internet sites for state, district and school level report cards)?*

- *Gender*
- *Race*
- *LEP status*
- *Migrant Status*
- *SWD*
- *SES*

Disaggregated data is generated for schools, district and state by gender, race/ethnicity, Special Programs (IEP, IAP, Gifted, Modified Admin, Migrant, Title I, Free and Reduced Lunch), In Building less than 1 year, In District less than 1 year.

State guidelines require that districts disaggregate achievement data for any racial/ethnicity group with more than thirty students which exceeds five percent of building enrollment.

4. Does trend data exist from the state assessments?

District profiles show trend data from 1993-94 on.

5. How are the results of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency reported? Are they included in the aggregate scores reported to the public, or disaggregated by group?

They are both aggregated and disaggregated; however, the disaggregated data is not routinely reported to the public.

6. What are the state's requirements for the use of data in school and district improvement planning?

Districts should use performance data when developing their Comprehensive School Improvement Plans.

7. Are changes planned for performance reporting (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the accountability system (Title I or in general)?

No changes are anticipated at this time.

8. What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of performance standards and reporting? Explain.

No particular challenges were identified.

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

1. Provide a brief overview and history of the accountability system as the context.

The main vehicle for accountability in Missouri is the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). Districts are required to prepare Comprehensive School Improvement Plans that detail how the district will adhere to the MSIP standards.

In addition, in accordance with the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993, schools may be identified as "academically deficient" or may receive recognition for improvement and high assessment results.

2. What are the characteristics of the state accountability system?

- *Who is held accountable (students, schools, districts)?*

- *For what are they held accountable (adequate yearly progress, student achievement, processes, multiple non-cognitive indicators, etc)?*
- *Using what criteria (state assessments, local assessments, both state and local criteria)?*
- *To what targets or performance levels?*
- *With what consequences (promotion or graduation, program improvement, additional planning, state takeover, rewards, assistance, etc.)?*

Organize the response into the following subsections:

- *Student Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

Missouri does not have high stakes assessment or other form of student accountability.

- *School Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

From the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993:

By July 1, 1996, the state board of education shall develop a procedure and criteria for determining that a school in a school district is “academically deficient”. In making such a determination for any school, the state board of education shall consider the results for the school from the assessment system...

Prior to a decision that a school is academically deficient, the state board of education shall appoint an audit team of at least ten persons to conduct an education audit of the school to determine the factors that have contributed to the lack of student achievement ... and make a finding as to whether the school is academically deficient.

Following a decision that a school is academically deficient, the state board of education shall, within sixty days, appoint a management team of at least ten persons to conduct any necessary investigations and make any recommendations the team believes are appropriate for the administration and management of the school necessary to promote student achievement and any additional resources which are required. Funds shall be provided, upon appropriation...

A district school board member of a district which contains a school declared academically deficient may be removed by the voters in a recall election...

... a district board of education may suspend indefinite contracts and issue probationary contracts to all certificated staff in a school declared academically deficient.

The details of the definition of “academically deficient” schools are still being refined. As a preliminary indicator of academically deficient status, the state looks at districts in which the graduation rate is less than 65%. As a rule, the 50 worst performing schools on the MAP will be identified as academically deficient in a given year. This determination is made at the state level.

An assessment team visits schools to confirm if one is indeed academically deficient. This assessment team makes a report to the State Board of Education. They are followed by a second team that meets with staff and administration to develop an improvement plan.

As an incentive/reward for improvement, schools may apply for the designation as an A+ School. They may receive this designation and additional state funds after meeting program requirements. For more information on the A+ Schools program, please refer to the section on “Identifying and Assisting Low-Performing Schools.”

Finally, the state identifies schools that achieved the highest scores overall, and those that made the most improvement. In January 2000, Missouri identified 200 schools with the highest scores, and 155 most-improved.

- *District Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

Districts in Missouri are held accountable for adhering to the Missouri School Improvement Program Standards and Indicators. Districts are required to have a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan that specifies how the district will meet the MSIP standards.

The General Provisions of the of the Missouri School Improvement Program are as follows:

(1) ... the Missouri School Improvement Program is comprised of qualitative and quantitative standards for school districts. The standards are organized in three section – Resource Standards, Process Standards, and Performance Standards. The standards are supported by appendices with include: the minimum graduation requirements, media standards for school learning resources centers, teacher certification requirements and assessment program standards.

(2) During each school year, beginning with the 1990-91 academic year, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will select school districts which will be reviewed and classified in accordance with this rule... After July 1, 1996 all school districts will be reviewed and classified under the standards and procedures of the MSIP on a rotation basis once every five years.

(3) The State Board of Education will assign classification designations of unaccredited, provisionally accredited and accredited based on the standards of the MISP.

(4) As a condition of receiving designation other than unaccredited, each school district reviewed under the MSIP must file a school improvement plan... and implement it in accordance with a specified schedule.

(5) A school district's classification designation based on the standards of the MSIP will remain in effect until the State Board of Education approves another designation. The State Board of Education will consider changing a district's classification designation after its regularly scheduled review or upon the board's determination that the district has –

(a) failed to implement its school improvement plan at an acceptable level

(b) implemented its school improvement plan substantially and, therefore, may qualify for a higher classification designation, or

(c) altered significantly the scope or effectiveness of the programs or services upon which the original classification designation was based.

(6) ...A school district designated unaccredited by the State Board of Education under the provisions of this rule during the 1995-96 school year or thereafter will be liable for tuition and transportation for resident students legally transferring to another district under the provisions of section 167.131, RSMo from the date of the action by the State Board of Education through the end of the school year during which the State Board of Education awards the district a designation of provisionally accredited or higher.

(7) Any school district which on June 30, 1997 or any succeeding June 30, thereafter, has been unaccredited... for two successive year will be subject to lapsing under the provisions of section 162.081, RSMo.

(8) The board of education of any school district which is dissatisfied with the classification designation assigned by the State Board of Education may request a hearing before the commissioner of education...

3. *What methods of measuring progress are used in the state accountability system?*

- *Relative growth*
- *Absolute target*
- *Narrowing the Gap between high and low achievers*
- *Other*

Missouri's achievement goals are part of the MSIP accountability system. These goals encompass relative growth objectives as well as narrowing the gap between high and low achievers. Academic goals come under the headings of Performance Standards and fall into the following categories: General Academic Achievement, Reading Achievement, Career Preparation, and Educational Persistence.

General Academic Achievement:

1. The percent of MAP-tested key skills mastered by the median student increases or is maintained at a high level, or students' scores on other performance assessments that are approved by the assessment section of DESE increase or are maintained at a high level.
2. The percent of students scoring in the two highest quintiles on the MAP increases by 3% or is maintained at a high level, while the percent of students scoring in the two lowest quintiles decreases by 3% or is maintained at a low level.
3. The percent of students who attain the graduation outcomes that have been identified by the district increases or is maintained at a high level.

Reading Achievement:

The reading ability of the district's students is at an acceptable level or demonstrates improvement. ...the reading skills of third-grade and eighth-grade students will be evaluated to determine if the students' reading skills are at an acceptable level. If students are not achieving at an acceptable level, appropriate instruction is implemented for each child...

Career Preparation:

The percent of students demonstrating adequate preparation for postsecondary education and/or employment is at a high level or is increasing.

Educational Persistence:

1. The percent of students who drop out of school decreases or is maintained at a low level.
2. The percent of district dropouts who complete a high school diploma or equivalency certificate within five years of when they dropped out increases or is maintained at a high level.
3. The percent of the district's students who are in regular daily attendance increases or is maintained at a high level.

Missouri has established the following general goals for the state:

- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.

- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.
- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.
- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

As part of the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan process, schools are to identify critical issues, and write objectives which detail what the district hopes to achieve in five years relative to that issue. The objectives must primarily focus on improving student performance, as determined by the MSIP Performance Standards. Examples of measurable performance objectives include:

- The average daily attendance will be 97% or higher
- The district's annual dropout rate will be reduced to 3% or less.
- Seventy-five percent of the district's students will score in the proficient and advanced levels on the MAP.

4. Are all students included in calculating the measures of progress? If not, who is excluded?

Missouri has the goal of including as many students as possible in the MAP, hence all – or almost all – students will be included in measures of progress.

5. How do the general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I schools compare? Are they the same, or different? How?

The general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I are different, see responses to Title I questions, below.

6. Are subgroup performance results used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures? If so, how? To identify schools or districts in need of improvement? For recognition and rewards?

Subgroup performance is being incorporated into the accreditation process. Schools will be required to analyze disaggregated scores to ensure that different populations are making gains that are at least equal to that of non-minority populations.

7. Are charter and/or non-public schools included in the accountability system? If so, how?

Non-public schools are not included in the process, as the department has no statutory right to accredit non-public schools. Charter schools will be phased into the process.

8. Are changes planned for the state accountability system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?

A new cycle of MSIP standards will be implemented in the 2001-2002 school year.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of accountability? Explain.*

Major issues include the use of data for school accreditation. School districts have to test at least 90% of their students at each grade level in each subject in order for their test data to be eligible for consideration under the state accountability/accreditation system.. In addition, the increased emphasis on student achievement has had a great impact on the system and on schools.

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

1. *How are schools and districts identified as low performing? Using what criteria? Do the identification processes and/or criteria differ for Title I and non-Title I schools?*

As noted in “Accountability,” above, schools may be designated “academically deficient,” the first indicator of which is low graduation rate (less than 65% for the district) followed by low scores on the MAP. As a rule, the 50 lowest-scoring schools in the state are designated as academically deficient.

2. *Does the district or the state decide whether a school is low performing? If the district is involved in the process, how much discretion do they have?*

The state identifies schools that are academically deficient. Schools are first considered “candidates” for this status if they have low graduation rates. Then an assessment team from the state visits the school to determine if this designation is appropriate.

3. *What types of assistance are provided to these schools and districts by the state?*

- *Evaluation and Planning* yes
- *Financial*
- *Expert Assistance* yes

4. *Who provides the state assistance?*

- *School/district support teams* yes, see below
- *Regional centers* yes, see below
- *Distinguished educators* yes, see below
- *SDE staff* yes, see below
- *Other – Explain*

Missouri has established “Success Teams” that are composed of department personnel working with regional professional development centers. These teams work primarily in districts that are not performing well, and help to develop plans that staff could incorporate into instruction to improve student performance. These teams are assisted by “Star Teachers” who are given a leave of absence to work in professional development centers to introduce teaching techniques, develop instructional procedures, etc. Additional assistance comes from universities and other educators. Beginning in the academic year 2000-2001, these teams will intervene in school buildings rather than districts.

5. *Does support to Title I and all low performing schools and districts differ? Is support generally provided for all schools and districts, or are services specifically designed to help those that are low performing?*

The system of identifying academically deficient schools is separate from the Title I system of identifying schools that are not making adequate yearly progress, although there is a great deal of overlap.

An additional source of support for schools is the A+ Schools Program, established by the Outstanding Schools Act of 1993. The program was designed to encourage school improvement in all schools, not only those that have been identified as academically deficient. The State Board of Education approves high schools for A+ designation once they have met the program requirements. In most cases, high schools spend three years implementing the program by upgrading curriculum, reducing dropout rates, promoting high student achievement and establishing business advisory councils. Students who graduate from a designated A+ School may qualify for state-paid assistance (full tuition and books) to attend any public community college or technical school in the state.

6. *Has the state established a set of criteria and/or a process for getting schools and districts out of low performing status? If so, what do they include?*

Schools lose their academically deficient status when their MAP scores improve and they are no longer among the 50 lowest-performing schools in the state.

7. *Once a school or district is identified as low performing, what types of plans must it prepare? Who are they submitted to once completed? How do they differ from other planning documents?*

Schools that are academically deficient must prepare an improvement plan with the assistance of the “Success Teams” that are organized through regional professional development centers. These teams are assisted by “Star teachers” who help other teachers to incorporate new instructional methods that should help student achievement.

8. *Are changes planned for the state system of identifying and assisting low performing schools or districts (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

A more complete definition of academically deficient schools is still being developed.

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

1. *What criteria are included in the definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts under Title I?*

- *What measures are used (relationship between cognitive/non-cognitive data)?*
- *What targets have been established?*
- *Are local assessment systems included as criteria? If so, does the state provide guidance? Monitor their use?*

- *Is subgroup performance included in the criteria?*

The data used to measure adequate yearly progress is from the Missouri Assessment Program. In the case of a district not making AYP for three consecutive years, the district may submit alternative data, which may include:

- Data of all students in the grade(s) assessed who are currently being served by Title I and those that have been served previously by Title I.
- Data of all students currently being served by Title I
- Performance and all students in the grade(s) assessed in the schools receiving Title I services.

2. *What are the definitions of adequate yearly progress for the following:*

- *Title I schools and non-Title I schools*
- *Targeted vs. schoolwide programs, charter, non-public and small schools*
- *Districts*

Are these transitional or final definitions? If transitional, when will the final definitions be in place and what criteria and processes will they include?

In order to make Adequate Yearly Progress, a school or district must achieve:

- A. At least a five percent (5%) increase in the composite percent of student in the upper three performance levels; and,
 - B. At least a five percent (5%) decrease in the percent of students appearing in the bottom performance level.

OR

- A twenty percent (20%) decrease in the percent of students appearing in the bottom performance level at schools in which at least forty percent (40%) of the class group is represented in the bottom level.

OR

- Any year in which the percent of students in the bottom performance levels equals 5% or less the district will have made Adequate Yearly Progress.

All students who are assessed with the state assessment for reading and math are included in the district measure of Adequate Yearly Progress.

3. *What is the process for identifying those schools and districts that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools? If the districts plays a role, does the state provide guidance on local criteria?*

It is the responsibility of districts to determine which schools are making adequate yearly progress, but the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) does have a print out on the adequate yearly progress status of schools. It is DESE's responsibility to identify districts that did not make adequate yearly progress based on district data. It is the district's

responsibility to examine data to find the schools that did not make adequate yearly progress. The district then must assist and support those schools to examine school level data and plan for school improvement based on the best research that can be found about effective schools and improved teaching and learning.

4. What are the criteria and processes for identifying schools and districts in need of improvement under Title I? What plans must be prepared? How can a school or district get out of Program Improvement? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools?

Districts that do not make adequate yearly progress for three consecutive years will be allowed to submit alternative data at the end of the third year before corrective action is taken. Districts that do not make adequate yearly progress in both reading and math are designated for school improvement. Making adequate yearly in either reading or math breaks the “three consecutive years” cycle.

The district has the responsibility for identifying schools within the district that need to engage in school improvement activities.

5. What types of assistance are provided to those in need of improvement under Title I?

- *Evaluation and Planning*
- *Financial*
- *Expert Assistance*

The state provides all of the above.

6. Who provides the assistance?

- *School/district support teams* yes
- *Regional centers* yes
- *Distinguished educators* yes
- *SDE staff* yes
- *Other – Explain*

Missouri has a full time program assistance staff that works out of area offices, directly with the schools. Each office works with 55 or 60 districts, focusing attention on those that have not made adequate yearly progress or those that are in danger of losing full certification. They work with districts and schools on all issues that have to do with school improvement.

Distinguished educators work on school support teams, with a concentration on schoolwide planning.

Missouri also has regional centers to aid with school improvement.

7. Have waivers played a role in this process?

Waivers do not play a significant role in Missouri.

8. Are there future plans for the state system for schools or districts receiving Title I funding (proposed or enacted and to be implemented) or for the definition of adequate yearly progress? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?

Missouri re-examines their definition of adequate yearly progress regularly, and works to ensure that the AYP definition is compatible with the MSIP performance standards.

9. Is there alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems for adequate yearly progress?

The systems are not aligned: the MSIP Performance Standards are broader and take into consideration a range of performance indicators, including non-cognitive measures. In addition, the Title I definition of adequate yearly progress requires a higher percentage of growth, and places a slightly greater emphasis on improving the achievement of students at the lowest performance levels.

10. What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of Title I? Explain.

Improvement of reading instruction poses the biggest challenge for Title I, although this is not exclusively a Title I issue. Missouri also questions whether schoolwide programs are the most effective means for addressing the needs of low-achieving and high-poverty students.

Note: Missouri has established a Committee of Practitioners, a group of educators who are connected with the Title I program. They include four Title I teachers, five district Title I administrators, one superintendent, two building principals, and one parent. They are from all parts of the State. They are charged with advising the State on policy for the implementation of Title I as legislated in IASA.

Contact Information

Assessment

James L. Friedebach
Director of Assessment
Division of Instruction
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
PO Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-3545
jfriedeb@mail.dese.state.mo.us

Accountability

Carl Sitze
Director
Missouri School Improvement Program
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
PO Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-4426
csitze@mail.dese.state.mo.us

Title I

Dee Beck

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

PO Box 480

Jefferson City, MO 65102

(573) 751-8284

dbeck@mail.dese.state.mo.us