

Data Topic	Description	Findings	Observations
Elementary vs Secondary	Changes of numbers in most prominent SWD categories from elementary to secondary using Ages 6 thru 11 and 12 thru 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The total numbers of SWDs is stable in each age grouping</li> <li>Number of secondary S/Lng Impairment is 1/4<sup>th</sup> of elementary #s</li> <li>Numbers of LD and ED almost double in the secondary</li> <li>Numbers of OHI and MR increase by 1.5 and 1.4 respectively in the secondary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most severe cases of LD, ED, AU and, MR/DD are likely identified in the elementary years with less severe cases identified in the secondary years</li> <li>Speech impairment has a very low incidence rate in the secondary</li> <li>Speech and language impairment occur less frequently in secondary but represent most severe of each</li> </ul>
Accountability	2008-2010 percent proficient for Dist/Sch w/30 or more accountable student by category in CA and math	<p>State totals (including MAP-A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CA—"ALL" went from 60% to 62% (545 dist/1,998 schools)</li> <li>CA—IEP went from 36.9 to 37.8 (320 dist/760 schools)</li> <li>Math—"ALL" from 55.3% to 61.7%</li> <li>Math—IEP 35.9% to 39.6%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEP students were the lowest performing subpop in both CA and Math over these 3 years.</li> <li>Around 59% of districts and 38% of schools have sufficient numbers to be accountable</li> <li>No school met the standards without MAP-A</li> </ul>
Socio-Economic	Identified percentage of IEPs in the following categories: Unreduced, reduced and free lunch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 10% of non-F/R have IEPs</li> <li>About 13% of reduced have IEPs</li> <li>About 16% of free lunch have IEPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almost 60% of SWDs are on F/R lunch</li> <li>Students on free/reduced lunch are almost 1.5 times as likely to have an IEP as students not on free or reduced</li> </ul>
Graduation rates	Provides changes in graduation rates for "ALL" students and SWDs from 2011-2013; compared results for primary categories of SWDs in 2011 and 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALL students: 2011 = 81.3%, 2013 = 87.7% a change of 6.4%</li> <li>SWDs: 2011 = 68.6%, 2013 = 76.3% an increase of 7.7%</li> <li>LD and OHI had best rates in 2012 at 75.7 and 77.5% respectively</li> <li>ED had the lowest rate at 55.5% in 2012</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Between 2011 and 2013 the 4 yr. graduation rate for SWDs increased slightly better than for ALL students</li> <li>LD, OHI and ED must all continue to improve to close the gap</li> <li>SWD grad rates improve by about 5% when using a 5-yr rate over a 4-yr rate</li> </ul>
Discipline	Compares discipline data for each category of SWD relative to the percentage of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students with autism are ½ as likely as other SWD to be involved in a disciplinary issue</li> <li>ED students are 3-4 Xs more likely to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discipline rates for SWDs is about twice as high as for non-disabled students</li> <li>ED and LD more likely to experience long term disciplinary removal</li> </ul>

		<p>be involved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OHI are 1.5-1.8 Xs more likely</li> <li>• LD are about as likely as SWDs</li> <li>• Sp/Lg Impaired are ½ to ¼ as likely</li> </ul>	
Incidence rates and proficiency of districts viewed by poverty strata	All districts placed in a quartile based on poverty (equal numbers in each). MAP-A were not included in these counts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 (lowest poverty) had the highest rate of performance (31.9% of districts were above 30% proficiency)</li> <li>• 80.8% of all districts had proficiency rates lower than 30%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 3 of 4 quartiles, achievement improved as incidence rate increased</li> <li>• Q3 (57.4-67.6% poverty) achievement was largely unaffected by incidence rates (Q3 had lowest rates of inclusion)</li> </ul>
Inclusion and proficiency of districts viewed by poverty strata	All districts placed in a quartile based on poverty (equal numbers in each). MAP-A not included in these counts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 36.6% of all districts had inclusion rates greater than 70%</li> <li>• Q3 (57.4-67.6% poverty) had the lowest overall inclusion rates (74.6% of districts with less than 70% inclusion)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In low poverty districts (Q 1 and Q2), achievement tends to improve as inclusion increases</li> <li>• Q3 largely unaffected by inclusion rates</li> <li>• In high poverty districts (Q4), performance decreases as inclusion increases</li> </ul>
Proficiency levels	Compares SWD (excludes MAP-A) to ALL students; compares major categories of SWDs to each other; compares major categories of SWDs by age groupings (6-11 and 12-17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All CA 2007 = 44.7%, 2012 =55%</li> <li>• SWD CA 2007 = 17.6%, 2012 = 27.4%</li> <li>• All math 2007 = 45%, 2012 =55%</li> <li>• SWD math 2007 = 20.9%, 2012 = 29.8%</li> <li>• Elem SWD CA proficiency = 18.8%</li> <li>• Sec SWD CA proficiency = 29.4%</li> <li>• Elem SWD math proficiency = 23.2%</li> <li>• Sec SWD math proficiency = 23.7%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over time, SWDs are increasing in the top 2 proficiency levels at rates similar to All students</li> <li>• SWDs tend to perform better in math and science than in ELA</li> <li>• SWD have narrower gaps w/All in mathematics and science</li> <li>• Speech Impairment score just slightly below All students</li> <li>• LD, OHI and ED need marked improvement to close any gap and primarily account for the significant gap between SWDs and All students</li> </ul>
LRE	Compares LRE by SWD category and by age spans 6-11 and 12-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mo is lower than Nat. avg in &gt; 80% or more but surpasses Nat. avg when adding in &gt; 40%</li> <li>• 85% of SWDs spend 40% or more of their time in general ed. classrooms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MR has the lowest rates of inclusion of the major categories</li> <li>• Secondary appears less inclusive but that is mostly a result of the numbers of Sp/Lng at elementary</li> </ul>

Post-Secondary	Reviews post-secondary outcomes (college and career)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MO data show little change over the past several years.</li><li>• Attend at both 2-year colleges and non-college training is slightly higher for SWD than for all students.</li><li>• Attendance at 4-year college lags significantly for SWD (about 23% points difference)</li><li>• Competitive employment for SWD is 6-7% higher for SWD than for All)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LD, autism exhibit positive college attendance at rates not forecast by proficiency rates</li><li>• ED and TBI lag significantly in college enrollment and competitive employment.</li></ul>
----------------	--	---	--