Measure	Group 1 Highest Minority	Group 2 Highest FRPL	Group 3 Title Schools	Group 4 Most Rural	Group 5 Non-Title Schools	Group 6 Lowest FRPL
FRPL rate	91.6%	100.0%	67.8%	60.5%	41.5%	16.5%
% of Minority (Students)	85.1%	60.5%	28.7%	3.3%	14.1%	14.8%
% of Minority (Teachers)	31.3%	22.6%	9.1%	1.1%	3.3%	3.6%
Discipline Incident Rate	3.0%	2.9%	0.9%	0.5%	1.6%	0.7%
• Elementary	1.0%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
• Middle/Junior	7.5%	5.4%	4.6%	1.0%	1.4%	0.6%
• High School	5.3%	4.3%	3.9%	1.0%	1.6%	1.7%
Average years of experience	10.5	10.6	11.7	12.2	12.8	13.7
Average Salaries	$51,683.47	$47,218.35	$45,174.30	$38,241.27	$49,236.96	$57,053.45
• 1st year teacher w/Bacc	$39,305.35	$37,426.66	$35,276.46	$31,215.26	$36,051.78	$38,974.29
• 1st year teacher w/Mast	$46,927.25	$46,639.25	$43,276.32	$36,615.86	$42,839.44	$46,400.21
• Teachers w/ 5 years of experience or less	$42,833.29	$39,940.08	$37,736.15	$33,350.29	$39,824.72	$43,305.92
• Teachers w/ 6-10 years of experience or less	$48,790.19	$44,955.27	$42,411.25	$36,595.47	$44,690.10	$49,007.41
• Teachers w/ 11+ years of experience	$59,047.19	$53,527.76	$50,050.63	$41,465.89	$53,483.04	$61,929.66
Retention Rate 1 year (2017-2018)	71.2%	73.3%	79.9%	81.9%	82.5%	83.4%
Retention Rate 3 year (2015-2018)	42.4%	45.7%	55.9%	58.3%	59.9%	64.8%
% First year teachers	12.9%	11.4%	7.7%	6.7%	5.0%	3.3%
% of Teachers with less than 3 years of experience	21.9%	20.5%	14.5%	13.1%	10.5%	7.8%
1st Year Principals	13.0%	12.0%	12.0%	14.4%	10.1%	9.5%
1st year teachers assigned a mentor	80.5%	85.1%	92.5%	97.7%	96.4%	94.6%
Avg. overall preparation 1st year Teacher response (%) Good/Very Good	80.5%	76.3%	82.8%	78.2%	84.9%	88.6%
Avg. overall preparation 1st year Principal response (%) Good/Very Good	85.0%	90.9%	84.8%	79.2%	87.3%	100.0%
% Less than fully Qualified	12.8%	13.0%	8.2%	15.8%	9.2%	3.6%
• Elementary	8.3%	9.0%	6.1%	9.7%	1.4%	2.6%
• Middle/Junior	17.2%	16.4%	13.9%	12.7%	5.7%	3.5%
• High School	24.2%	24.2%	26.2%	24.0%	15.2%	5.7%
% Teaching Out-of-Field	11.4%	11.6%	7.0%	14.1%	8.0%	3.0%
• Elementary	7.1%	7.8%	5.1%	8.4%	0.8%	2.0%
• Middle/Junior	15.4%	14.5%	12.3%	11.2%	4.7%	2.9%
• High School	22.4%	22.3%	23.8%	21.8%	13.8%	5.1%
Effectiveness Index Overall teacher impact	73.2%	73.4%	75.7%	75.4%	75.2%	78.2%
Student Performance: ELA Proficient or Advanced	27.6%	30.8%	43.4%	47.6%	54.7%	64.9%
Student Performance: Math Proficient or Advanced	21.2%	24.7%	38.1%	40.3%	44.4%	58.2%

- **Group 1**—Highest Minority schools (318 schools). Non-White students and Hispanics of any race
- **Group 2**—Highest FRPL of schools (318 schools). Students eligible for Free and Reduced lunch
- **Group 3**—Title I Schools (1210 schools: Targeted(242) or Schoolwide(968))
- **Group 4**—Most Rural Schools (352 schools). NCES Urbanicity Classification "Rural: Remote"
- **Group 5**—Non-Title Schools (955 Schools)
- **Group 6**—Lowest FRPL of schools (318 schools). Students eligible for Free and Reduced lunch

The data draws upon the most recent data available. In most cases, the data correspond to the 2017-18 school year. The "Definitions" section below indicates specific exceptions to this rule where applicable, as well as cases in which multiple years were combined.

Schools included in the analysis are all Missouri public elementary and secondary schools, except as follows:

- Area vocational/technical schools and alternative schools are excluded since data are reported at students' regular schools in their home districts.
- Correctional facilities and medical treatment centers are excluded.
- Division of Youth Services sites is excluded.

To assist with interpreting the data contained in the chart, the following definitions and information are offered for each of the measures in the table:

***Poor student**: A student eligible for a free or reduced priced lunch (FRPL). The 318 schools with the highest rates of FRPL students (100 percent) are referred to as "high-poverty" schools. These are compared with the 318 schools with the lowest rates of FRPL students (3.8 – 27.5 percent), referred to as "low-poverty" schools. Data submitted by districts through Screen 15 of October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Rural: Remote**: Census-defined rural territory that is more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and also 10 miles from an urban cluster. The "rural: remote" designations used in this plan were extracted from the National Center for Education Statistics' Elementary/Secondary Information System (ELSI) and correspond to the 2017-18 school year (most recent available data). Schools that meet these criteria are referred to as "rural schools".

***Minority:** Non-white students/teachers, including Hispanic of any race. 318 schools with the highest average (85.1 percent) of minority students are referred to as "high-minority" schools. Data submitted by districts through Screen 16 of October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Discipline rate**: The number of incidents divided by the number of students (incident is when a student is removed from the regular classroom half (1/2) a day or more). Data submitted by districts through Screen 09 of June Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Retention rate**: Percent of teachers retained from 2017 to 2018 (one-year retention rate), or from 2015 to 2018 (three-year retention rate). A teacher is considered to be retained if, in 2018, he or she remained employed as a teacher in the same school where he or she was employed in either 2017 (for the one-year analysis) or 2015 (for the three-year analysis). Data submitted by districts through Screen 18 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Assigned a mentor:** Average of first-year teachers that marked they had a mentor in the statewide data collection effort known as the First-Year Teacher Survey conducted by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) in collaboration with the

University of Missouri's Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA).

***Overall Preparation 1st year Teacher/Principal:** Average of first-year teachers/principals that responded Good or Very Good that "best reflects their perspective about the overall quality of the professional education program they completed" in the statewide data collection effort known as the First-Year Teacher/Principal Surveys conducted by (DESE) in collaboration with (OSEDA).

***Inexperienced teacher**: A first- year teacher. Data submitted by districts through Screen 18 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Less than fully qualified (for the statutory term "unqualified")** – A teacher who meets one or more of the following criteria:

- Is teaching on a provisional certificate
- Is teaching on a temporary authorization certificate
- Is lacking the necessary credential to be considered appropriately certified for at least one teaching assignment

Data is combined from Certification and data submitted by districts through Screen 20 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Out-of-field:** A teacher who is considered inappropriately certified by virtue of teaching a subject that does not correspond to one or more of the teacher's active certifications. Data is combined from Certification and data submitted by districts through Screen 20 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

***Effective Index**: An average overall rating of the general collective effectiveness of the teachers in a school. Since Missouri does not mandate a single evaluation model for all LEAs, an index was developed to summarize aggregate teacher effectiveness ratings for each school in the most consistent manner possible. On Screen 18a of Core Data, an annual data collection by the Department that occurs at the end of the school year, LEAs submit the number of teachers evaluated that year within each of the summative performance levels used in the local evaluation system. The data are reported in order of increasing effectiveness. The number of teachers in each level is assigned a point value equal to the rank position of the level. The total point value of the teachers' collective ratings is then divided by the maximum points possible based on the parameters of the local system. For example, in a five-level system in which 10 teachers were evaluated, the maximum point value possible would be 50 (10 x 5 = 50). If each teacher were rated at the second highest effectiveness level, that collective effectiveness would be worth 40 points (10 x 4 = 40). In this situation, the index would be calculated at .80 (40/50 = .80).

According to a number of measures contained in the table, these data suggest that the learning

experience of students in high-poverty, high-minority and rural schools compared to students in low-poverty schools is quite different. High-poverty, high-minority and rural students appear to learn from less-experienced, unqualified, out-of-field, or less-effective teachers at higher rates than occur in low-poverty school.