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MSIP 5 and District Performance

- Introductions
- MSIP 5 & APR Review
- Guiding Documents to Help with Planning
- CSIP and 8 Step Planning Process
- Changes in Calculation of 2015 APR
- APR Changes for 2016 and Beyond
- Questions and Answers
1. All Missouri students will graduate college and career ready.
2. All Missouri children will enter kindergarten prepared to be successful in school.
3. Missouri will prepare, develop and support effective educators.
4. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will improve departmental efficiency and operational effectiveness.
MSIP 5 Performance Standards

1. Academic Achievement
2. Subgroup Achievement
3. College and Career Readiness (K-12)
   Or
3. High School Readiness (K-8)
4. Attendance
5. Graduation (K-12)
### Standard 1: Academic Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-12</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 3: College and Career Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*1-3 (SAT, ACT, COMPASS and ASVAB)</th>
<th>*4 (IB, AP, dual credit, TSA/IRC, dual enrollment and PLTW)</th>
<th>*5-6 (post secondary placement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 3: High School Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 4: Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-12</th>
<th>K-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 5: Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Achievement

- Utilizing MAP Performance Index in MSIP 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 1*2 MAP ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Measures</th>
<th>Status Points Earned</th>
<th>MPI Score (3-Year Average)</th>
<th>Progress Measures</th>
<th>Progress Points Earned</th>
<th>Progress Measure Description</th>
<th>Growth Measures</th>
<th>Growth Points Earned</th>
<th>Growth Measure Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020 Target</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>392.8 - 500</td>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5% of MPI Gap increase</td>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>a statistically significant score&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Track</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>358.2 - 392.7</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3% of MPI Gap increase</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>not statistically significant growth estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approaching</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300.0 – 358.1</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1% of MPI Gap increase</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0 – 299.9</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1% of MPI Gap increase</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a statistically significant score &lt;50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level Not Determined (LND):** Zero (0) points will be awarded for data when the LND is exceeded.

**Academic Achievement Total:** Status + Progress OR Growth (whichever is higher)

A maximum of 16 points may be applied to the LEA or school level score.

Status targets change annually. See the Top 10 by 20 Projected Status Targets in the Appendix.
## Proposed Status Targets - Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>On Track</th>
<th>2020 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-358.1</td>
<td>358.2-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-360.5</td>
<td>360.6-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-362.9</td>
<td>363.0-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-365.3</td>
<td>365.4-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-367.7</td>
<td>367.8-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-370.1</td>
<td>370.2-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-372.5</td>
<td>372.6-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>100-299.9</td>
<td>300.0-374.9</td>
<td>375.0-392.7</td>
<td>392.8-500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MPI (1,3,4,5) Proposed Targets for Status (Academic Achievement)**
MSIP 5 Accreditation Levels

- Accredited with Distinction \( \geq 90\% \) of points + other criteria as determined

- Accredited \( \geq 70\% \) of points

- Provisional \( \geq 50\% \) to 69.9\% of points

- Unaccredited < 50\% of points
### MSIP5 Annual Performance Report (APR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSIP5 Annual Performance Report (APR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APR - Historical State Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR Summary Report - K-12 - Public</td>
<td>Contains the Mets/Not Mets for each standard, and sums the Total Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR Summary Report - K-8 - Public</td>
<td>Contains the Mets/Not Mets for each standard, and sums the Total Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR Supporting Data - K-12 - Public</td>
<td>Contains the data used to determine whether a standard was Met or Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR Supporting Data - K-8 - Public</td>
<td>Contains the data used to determine whether a standard was Met or Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Annual Performance Reports</td>
<td>Link to the District Info page which has a link to historical APR reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historical AYP – Federal Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AYP - Additional Indicator - Public</td>
<td>Contains school and district/LEA attendance and graduation rate data used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AYP - Grid</td>
<td>Official Federal Accountability Report (Grid) - Link to Understanding your AYP report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AYP - Summary - Public</td>
<td>Contains school and district/LEA group totals, overall met and sanction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACADEMIE LAFAYETTE

#### MSIP5 Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 - Summary Reports</th>
<th>MSIP5 Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSIP5 DRAFT Summary Report (LEA</td>
<td>School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIP5 Draft Annual Performance Indicator Report (LEA</td>
<td>School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIP5 Draft School Breakout By Standard</td>
<td>MSIP5 Performance Workbook K-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2 and 3 - Supporting Data Reports</th>
<th>MSIP5 Performance Workbook K-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSIP5 DRAFT Supporting Data Report (LEA</td>
<td>School)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Level 4 and 5 - Supporting Detail Reports | |
|------------------------------------------||
| Standard 1 -- MSIP5 Achievement Level | |
| Standard 2 -- MSIP5 Achievement Level -- Subgroup | |
| Standard 3 -- Graduation Rate (4 & 5 year) (updated nightly) (LEA | School) | |

| Level 5 - Student Detail Reports | |
|----------------------------------||
| These reports require MOSIS Student Level Access | |

| Standard 3 -- CCR Indicator 1-3 (ACT, SAT, COMPASS, ASVAB) (LEA | School) | |
| Standard 3 -- CCR Indicator 4 (AP, IB, Dual Credit/Enrollment, TSA) (LEA | School) | |
| Standard 3 -- CCR Indicator 5-5 - Postsecondary Follow-Up (LEA | School) | |
| Standard 3 (K-8) -- High School Readiness | |
| Standard 4 -- Attendance Rate (updated nightly) | |
| Student Attendance Report | |
| Standard 5 -- Graduation Rate (4 & 5 year) (updated nightly) (LEA | School) | |
DESE Resources: Help with Planning

- MSIP 5 Comprehensive Guide to MSIP
- MSIP 5 Performance Workbook
- MSIP 5 Plan for Support and Intervention Document
- CSIP Plan Document
- Area Supervisors and Consultants
Comprehensive Guide to the Missouri School Improvement Program

Updated July 2014
Comprehensive Guide to MSIP

- Revised Yearly
- Essential that Key People know and understand the contents of this document
- Provides information on all the details of your APR
What’s in It?

- TABLE OF CONTENTS
- Performance Standards for K-12 Districts
- Performance Standards for K-8 Districts
- MSIP 5 (APR) Scoring Guide
  - Standard 1: Academic Achievement
  - Standard 2: Subgroup Achievement
  - Standard 3: Indicators 1-3 College and Career Readiness (CCR) (K-12 LEAs only)
  - Standard 3: Indicator 4 College and Career Readiness (CCR) (K-12 LEAs only)
  - Standard 3: Indicators 5–6 College and Career Readiness (CCR) (K-12 LEAs only)
  - Standard 3: High School Readiness (HSR) (K-8 LEAs only)
  - Standard 4: Attendance Rate
  - Standard 5: Graduation Rate
- MSIP 5 Generating the APR Score
- MSIP 5 Generating Performance Indicator Flags
- MSIP 5 2014 Annual Performance Report (APR) Notes
- Performance Rubrics
Performance Rubrics

Appendix A Top 10 by 20 Projected Status Targets

Appendix B Assessment Schedule

Appendix C Assessment Scores Matrix

Appendix D Standard 3: College and Career Readiness*4 Scores Matrix

Appendix E Standard 3: College and Career Readiness*4 Dual Credit

Appendix F Approved Technical Skills Attainment (TSA)

Appendix G Career Education Placement/Follow-Up Guidelines

Appendix H Types of Appeals

Appendix I Missouri Growth Model Technical Documentation

Glossary
MSIP: Support and Intervention

Missouri School Improvement Program:
Support and Intervention
MSIP: Support and Intervention

Accredited with Distinction and Accredited Districts with at least 75% of possible APR points and no schools with less than 70% (Tier I)

Accredited Districts with less than 75% of possible APR points and/or 2 consecutive years of decline ≥ 5% of points and/or school(s) with less than 70% and/or within district achievement gap (Tier II a)

Tier II for two or more consecutive years (Tier II b)

Provisionally Accredited Districts (Tier III)

District CSIP

District Oversight of CSIP (Supports Optional)

Department Oversight of CSIP (Supports Recommended/Intervention Possible)

- Targeted Audit(s)
- Regional School Improvement Team
- Performance Contract

Unaccredited Districts (Tier IV)

- Performance Contract
- Fiscal Monitor Approved
- Governance Reviewed

All Operational Elements of Previous District Cease to Exist

State Support & Intervention

High

Loose

Low

Tight
CONCEPT OF THE CSIP
DEVELOPING A CSIP
RATIONALE FOR PLANNING
PLANNING
PROCESS
ORGANIZING A WRITTEN PLAN
PLAN COMPONENTS
The fifth version of the Missouri School Improvement Program 5 (MSIP 5), the state’s accountability system for reviewing and accrediting public school districts, outlines the expectations for student achievement with the ultimate goal of each student graduating ready for success in college and careers. The MSIP accountability system was established in 1990 and has evolved with each version. The MSIP 5 rule approved in August 2011 outlines the expectation for an improvement plan.

5 CSR 20-100.105(4) Missouri School Improvement Program - 5
As a condition of receiving a classification designation other than unaccredited, each school district reviewed under the MSIP must maintain a current school improvement plan in a format approved by the department. Districts identified through the MSIP as needing improvement must submit a school improvement plan for approval by the department.
Concept of the CSIP

Governance-2—The local board of education adopts and district leadership implements a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) to ensure the achievement and success of all students.

1. The local board of education and district leadership, in collaboration with the community, use qualitative data, quantitative data, and evaluation results to create a written, board-approved CSIP which drives improvement in student learning and guides the overall improvement of its educational programs and services.
2. The school district maintains a current CSIP that includes all of the required components.
3. There is a written evaluation process for the CSIP and the CSIP is regularly evaluated and updated.
4. The local board of education utilizes the CSIP to monitor progress and continuous improvement of programs and services.
The CSIP serves as a long-range planning tool for addressing student performance and describes a specific set of actions to be undertaken relative to these issues. It is not a document that simply identifies “what” the measurable objectives/goals for improvement will be; it is a document that details “how” the district intends to make the desired improvements. The CSIP is a means of determining how districts are ensuring that all students are college and career ready.

The expectation of the Department is all districts have a CSIP. Those districts who have been identified as needing a “Department approved” CSIP will receive specific criteria and guidance regarding the components of the plan. Those districts will work directly with the Department’s Area Supervisor from their region on plan development. Once approved by the Area Supervisor, the plan will be submitted by the district to the Department.

The state is interested in continuous effort being made by each district to bring about improvements in student achievement. The CSIP is the means through which this improvement is most likely to occur. Many districts have developed their own format and processes for the CSIP plan. A district’s CSIP plan will only be reviewed for MSIP purposes when determined by the Department. The Department will annually review student achievement data which could generate a need for a “Department approved” CSIP.
RATIONALE FOR PLANNING
The CSIP should detail the district’s plan to mobilize resources, redefine effective practices, and incorporate effective strategies and services identified to produce higher student performance as measured by the MSIP 5 performance indicators. A CSIP may also incorporate existing programs and services which are effective in producing high student performance. A CSIP is created by a district to serve as a “road map” for the long-range improvement the district hopes to realize over a three to five year period. The CSIP plan should be driven by data and designed to increase student performance.

No one plan fits all districts. The Department will outline components expected in a plan; however, each district will format and design its plan in a way that will be most effective for their district. Before developing or revising a CSIP, the district should consider how it will organize two key parts of its effort: the planning process and the written document or product of planning. The following guidance will assist districts engaged in the creation or revision of a CSIP in developing a better understanding of both the process and the product or plan document.
Developing a CSIP

PLANNING
It is important to remember that creating a CSIP charts the course for improved student performance. Having broad input into the plan for change is important to ensure all stakeholders are informed and held accountable to the plan. Planning should be focused on three to five key goals with a few strategies that are implemented with precision and fidelity to improve student achievement. The planning process is an opportunity to form a collaborative and effective culture with shared commitment and responsibility.

Districts should identify individuals who will assume leadership responsibilities in the process and those who will be a part of the collaborative team. The CSIP team should include all key stakeholders; the community, members of the district’s staff, and the board of education. To implement a highly effective plan, everyone in the district must understand the goals, expected outcomes, have vital roles of interdependency and share the same vision. It is essential that the team reflect a cross-section of the community if the plan is to be accepted by the community at large and those who must later implement the plan.

The planning process is a step-by-step set of actions that lead to the development of focused goals for improved student achievement. The document describes how the district will accomplish these goals and articulate the procedures and actions the district will take to accomplish them.
Regular review and evaluation of the plan is essential for effective implementation. The review will provide feedback to school boards, stakeholders and implementers of the plan supported with data benchmarks. Assisting a collaborative team through the planning process requires a leader with special skills in group dynamics and group processes. The facilitator is responsible for moving the team through the process and not for developing the plan. The team should assume responsibility for developing the plan.
# Developing a CSIP

## Example Process and Component Alignment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Process</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example CSIP Content Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and Readiness</td>
<td><strong>Build a common understanding and ownership for the school system improvement process. Develop a clear picture of what it will take to progress through the improvement process. The appropriate structures and supports for this to occur will be in place (i.e., planning team, district buy-in, shared vision).</strong></td>
<td>Description of the Planning Process Beliefs and Vision Statement Mission Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather and Organize Data</td>
<td><strong>Gather information from multiple indicators (achievement, demographic, perception, and contextual) and decide what data is most pertinent to the process. Select data to collect in five (5) categories: perception, achievement, behavior, contextual and demographics. Conduct a self-evaluation by each school district. Data is prepared to facilitate analysis using a data carousel activity by the leadership team.</strong></td>
<td>Analyze Internal and External Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze Data</td>
<td><strong>Make data decisions about what areas to focus on to achieve a desired and preferred future. Identify root causes of the issue. Completion of this stage will result in an analysis of data based on narratives, charts and graphs displaying the current status of the school and/or district system. A prioritised list of challenges will be generated and used in subsequent stages to develop S.M.A.R.T. goals and improvement plans.</strong></td>
<td>Continued Analysis of Internal and External Factors: Identify Strengths/Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize and Set Goals</td>
<td><strong>Determine priorities for local needs based on school/district strengths and challenges identified by data analysis. Challenges/concerns are grouped into themes. Clear measurable and time-bound S.M.A.R.T. goals are written and prioritized.</strong></td>
<td>Objectives (goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Identify Effective Strategies/Practices</td>
<td><strong>Identify effective research-based practices, strategies, programs, and/or interventions that address the state goals and root causes to provide the basis of improvement plans through additional research and analysis of data, identification of best practices, and site-visits. District will encourage individual schools to deal with issues systematically.</strong></td>
<td>Improvement Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Implement Plan(s)</td>
<td><strong>Focus specific improvement plans on prioritized area, describing the specific activities, timelines, persons responsible and outcome measures for each strategy, intervention, and/or program created. Implementation means putting the plan into practice fully by carrying out the tasks identified.</strong></td>
<td>Action Steps Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Implementation and Progress</td>
<td><strong>Monitor implementation of the action plan, identified strategies/practices and student progress to ensure continuous progress toward achieving school/district goals. Formative and summative measures and Implementation Coach Reports are used to see if progress is occurring toward each S.M.A.R.T. goal. Based on this information, plans are revised as necessary.</strong></td>
<td>Implement, Review and Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Revise</td>
<td><strong>Analyze formative and summative measures specified in the improvement plans to determine if student needs have been met. Data on system changes (structural goals) and student achievement (core goals) should be considered.</strong></td>
<td>Evaluate and Revise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revision Considerations

The CSIP is a long-range plan to improve student performance. The CSIP should only be rewritten every three to five years. However, the CSIP should be evaluated and reviewed annually for updates and modifications. Other reasons the CSIP may require modification include:

1. The Missouri School Improvement Program identified specific concerns which the district is required to address in its CSIP.
2. Career education standards require that districts evaluate the effectiveness of programs and create plans to improve those programs. In addition, districts that are receiving Federal Perkins funds and do not meet the state adjusted levels of performance must develop an accountability improvement plan separate from program improvement. Both of these plans should be reflected into the CSIP.
3. The Office of Special Education must report on identified performance objectives for students with disabilities. This office also has a number of improvement initiatives for students with disabilities identified in a five-year State Improvement Grant (SIG). Special education monitoring at the district level may generate long-range improvement concerns regarding provision of services and/or performance of students with disabilities. These concerns can be planned for by incorporating them into the CSIP. Local districts receiving Local Improvement Grants (LIG) will document the LIG objectives and strategies in their CSIP.
4. Federal Programs requires improvement of student performance. A lack of improvement of student performance requires a district to incorporate stronger strategies into its CSIP to better serve disadvantaged students.
5. Demographic changes or catastrophe or financial or transfer student or decreasing population.
6. Certain state and federal programs require that districts demonstrate adequate improvement in student performance. Failure to demonstrate adequate progress in meeting the performance objectives set out by such programs may also necessitate an update to the CSIP to increase the likelihood that these performance objectives are met. This update may consist of a team coming to the district to assist in revising the district’s CSIP.
Developing a CSIP and SIP

BUILDING LEVEL PLANNING
While districts are required to create a CSIP which describes improvement efforts, this plan alone may not be sufficient to bring about meaningful improvement. Therefore, each school should create a building-level school improvement plan that includes strategies and action steps which will help the district realize its improvement objectives.
Developing a CSIP

The state is focused on continuous efforts being made by each district to ensure improvements in student achievement. The CSIP is the foundational planning tool through which improvement is most likely to occur. School improvement plans, with the kind of substantive processes and goals described in this handbook, are essential to accomplish sustainable change. The plan should establish and outline an effective, focused, data-driven and measureable plan with intermittent checks with clear identifiers of responsibility.

Although the Department is not endorsing a particular CSIP format, it is important to note that districts identified as needing a “Department approved” CSIP will receive direct guidance regarding expected components of the plan. Many districts have developed their own format for the CSIP plan, and a district’s CSIP plan will only be under review when there is a decline in student performance. Typically, a district’s CSIP plan is located on the school website. The Department encourages districts to collaboratively utilize colleagues and research-based resources to support the development of the CSIP.
Changes in Calculation of 2015 APR

- **“Hold Harmless” for New 2015 English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessments**
  - **Standard Applicable:** Standards 1 & 2 – English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics
  - **Updated Policy:** The Department will calculate and report 2015 assessment data for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) across the state. After this process is complete, the Department will examine the “call” (points scored in a given area) for ELA and mathematics within Standards 1 and 2. If the points scored within the “call” in 2014 in ELA or mathematics are greater than in 2015, the 2014 “call” will be used in the calculation of the 2015 Annual Performance Report (APR). The same process will be used in the calculation of the 2016 APR.
    - The Department will outline this procedure in an upcoming administrative memo.

- **Calculation of Progress**
  - **Standard Applicable:** Standards 1 & 2 – English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics
  - **Updated Policy:** The Department will calculate progress for the 2015 APR using z-scores.
    - The Department will share further details in an upcoming administrative memo.
Changes in Calculation of 2015 APR

- **Census Administration of ACT® for Grade 11 Students**
  - **Standard Applicable:** Standard 3*1-3
  - **Updated Policy:** Established within Administrative Memo QS-15-002, dated January 8, 2015. Missouri will hold its first census administration of the ACT® for grade 11 students in 2015.
    - All grade 11 students who take the assessment will receive a reportable ACT® score and at least a 0.25 student weight in Standard 3*1-3 upon graduation.
    - The 11th grade census ACT® administration will produce two reportable items, a participation rate and an average composite score, that will appear on the APR Summary Data page and the District Report Card.
    - The group of total will be composed of all grade 11 students minus any MAP-Alternate students and any English language learner (ELL) students who have resided within the United States for less than a year.
Changes in Calculation of 2015 APR

- **ACT WorkKeys®**
  - Standard Applicable: Standard 3*1-3
  - Updated Policy: Established within Administrative Memo LS-14-002, dated May 7, 2014. The Department has included the ACT WorkKeys® workplace readiness assessment into Standard 3*1-3 beginning with the 2015 APR. In calculating this data, the Department will incorporate two years of prior ACT WorkKeys® data when calculating the 2015 APR. This policy conforms to precedent established by past changes to MSIP.

- **Definition of Placement**
  - Standard Applicable: Standard 3*5-6
  - Updated Policy: Established within Administrative Memo QS-15-003, dated January 12, 2015. In accordance with SB 701, the definition of placement for graduates who complete approved career education programs will be expanded within MSIP. LEAs will continue to report “Related” and “Not Related” placement for Perkins purposes. The APR calculation will capture both populations for credit on Standard 3*5-6.
APR Changes for 2016 and Beyond

- **Expansion of Career and Technical Education**
  - **Standard Applicable:** Standard 3*4
  - **Updated Policy:** *Established within Administrative Memo QS-15-003.* Beginning with the 2016 APR, a Local Education Agency (LEA) may receive two points toward the ten points possible in Standard 3*4 by creating and entering into a partnership with area career centers, comprehensive high schools, industry, or business to develop a pathway for students to accomplish each of the following:
    1. Enroll in a program of career and technical education while in high school;
    2. Participate and complete an internship or apprenticeship during their final year of high school;
    3. Obtain the industry certification or credentials applicable to their program or career and technical education and internship or apprenticeship.
For Assistance Contact:

- Office of Quality Schools – School Improvement
  - Jocelyn Strand, Coordinator  571.751.4104
    - jocelyn.strand@dese.mo.gov
  - TJ Spalty, Director  573.751.4426
    - tj.spalty@dese.mo.gov
  - Cathi Rust, Supervisor  573.751.4426
    - catherine.rust@dese.mo.gov

OR
Area Supervisors of Instruction

Regional Contacts

![Map of Missouri showing regional contacts for Area Supervisors of Instruction]

- **A** St. Louis Region
- **B** Kansas City Region
- **C** Southwest Region
- **D** Central Region
- **E** Southeast Region
- **F** West Central Region
- **G** South Central Region
- **H** Northwest Region
- **I** Northeast Region