

## **MSIP Findings**

- 1. Multiple changes in district level leadership contributes to a lack of sustained planning for improvement in student achievement throughout the district. (8.3)**

The district has developed a plan to evaluate programs and services; however, there is no evidence that the board formally evaluates programs and services on a regular schedule. Therefore, they are not able to take action to ensure that these programs efficiently achieve their goals. (8.1)

Board of Education members do not limit themselves to establishing policies and other activities specifically mentioned in the district's Board of Education Policy Manual. (The policies include but may not be limited to: BBA, BBP, and BDA). Further, board members are involved in implementing the policies and the day-to-day operation of the school district. (8.3)

The Board of Education has created and participates in a committee system that informs board action. The district's administrators make reports to the committees but do not serve on the committees. Resolutions suggested by these committees have been placed on the board's Consent Agenda and passed without due consideration by the board as a whole. This is in violation of the board's Policy BDDB and Regulation BDDB-R (8.3)

The district has initiated multiple new programs concurrently. This has resulted in frustrated and overwhelmed staff, lack of consistent implementation districtwide, lack of meaningful evaluation of the impact of the programs, and inadequate time for professional development around best practices in instruction. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7)

There is little evidence to indicate that the district uses common assessments other than the ones that accompany programs to assess students work and make instructional decisions. (6.2)

The district has initiated multiple new programs concurrently. This has resulted in frustrated and overwhelmed staff, lack of consistent implementation districtwide, lack of meaningful evaluation of the impact of the programs, and inadequate time for professional development around best practices in instruction. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7)

- 2. Board of Education members do not limit themselves to establishing policies and other activities specifically mentioned in the district's Board of Education Policy Manual. Further, board members are involved in implementing the policies and the day-to-day operation of the school district. (8.3)**

The district has developed a plan to evaluate programs and services; however, there is no evidence that the board formally evaluates programs and services on a regular schedule. Therefore, they are not able to take action to ensure that these programs efficiently achieve their goals. (8.1)

**Board of Education members do not limit themselves to establishing policies and other activities specifically mentioned in the district's Board of Education Policy Manual. (The policies include but may not be limited to: BBA, BBP, and BDA). Further, board members are involved in implementing the policies and the day-to-day operation of the school district. (8.3)**

**The Board of Education has created and participates in a committee system that informs board action. The district's administrators make reports to the committees but do not serve on the committees. Resolutions suggested by these committees have been placed on the board's Consent Agenda and passed without due consideration by the board as a whole. This is in violation of the board's Policy BDDB and Regulation BDDB-R (8.3)**

**3. A guaranteed and viable curriculum K-12 is not present in the district. (6.1)**

District use of GLEs as objectives results in isolated learning targets rather than meaningful, common clusters/units. Lack of alignment among objectives, learning activities, instructional methods and assessment makes it unlikely that student achievement will improve. There is no evidence of a district curriculum review cycle. (6.1)

The district has initiated multiple new programs concurrently. This has resulted in frustrated and overwhelmed staff, lack of consistent implementation districtwide, lack of meaningful evaluation of the impact of the programs, and inadequate time for professional development around best practices in instruction. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7)

There is little evidence to indicate that the district uses common assessments other than the ones that accompany programs to assess students work and make instructional decisions. (6.2)

There was a lack of rigor observed in most classroom instruction. (6.3.1)

The performance of students with disabilities on the MAP assessment is below State targets in all areas. This is consistent with the performance of all students in the district. (7.1.2)

Full-time elementary students are not provided 50 minutes of music instruction each week in one building. (1.1)

The district does not provide the minimum four required exploratory classes to seventh and eighth grade students in three buildings. The district provides a large number of exploratory classes for seventh and eighth grade students in six buildings. (1.2)

The district does not provide required health courses to seventh and eighth grade students in two buildings. (1.2)

The district does not meet the minimum standards in its high school program of studies in four buildings. In two buildings, the district provides the minimum number of high school credits in all subject areas, the desirable number of high school credits in at least seven subject areas, and provided classes in four of the seven career education areas over a two-year period of time. (1.3)

The district's librarian-to-student staffing does not meet the minimum standard in six buildings. The district's librarian-to-student staffing ratio meets the desirable standards in thirty-nine elementary schools, eight middle schools and five high schools. (3.1)

**The district's counselor-to-student staffing does not meet the minimum standards in six buildings. The district's counselor-to-student staffing ratio meets the desirable standards in thirty-six elementary schools, six middle schools and seven high schools. (3.2)**

**The district's principal-to-student staffing ratio meets the minimum standard at all levels and the desirable standard in thirty-five elementary schools, eight middle schools and seven high schools. (4.3)**

**Eighty staff members are not appropriately certificated for a total of two hundred sixty-two assignments. (73.09 FTE) This total includes seventy teachers, thirty-six of whom have substitute certificates, forty with inappropriate certificates and one with no certificate. This also includes three guidance counselors, four library media specialists, and three administrators, three of whom have substitute certificates and seven with inappropriate certificates.**

- 4. There is a lack of academic rigor in instruction, assessment and instruction. Professional development is focused on multiple, frequently changing programs, rather than on high quality curriculum and research-based instructional strategies. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.7)**

There is little evidence to indicate that the district uses common assessments other than the ones that accompany programs to assess students work and make instructional decisions. (6.2)

When standardized test data are distributed to schools in the district, there is no procedure or common practice in place on how to utilize that data. (6.2)

There was a lack of rigor observed in most classroom instruction. (6.3.1)

Classroom observations indicated very little use of research-based instructional strategies. (6.3.1)

Team observations indicated a lack of differentiated instruction. Staff AQ indicated that they believed that they were adapting instruction, but focus groups indicated that there was not a clear understanding of what differentiated instruction means. (6.3.1)

There is little evidence that current professional development efforts are impacting classroom instruction or student achievement. (6.7)

Teachers indicate that the expectations for participation in professional development activities change yearly as administrators change. District direction is top down, not always data driven, with little teacher input. Professional development is program based rather than teacher driven. (6.7)

Although there is a written professional development plan in place, there is little evidence that the plan is implemented. There is a lack of documentation such as minutes and agendas to prove plan is effective. (6.7)

Current professional development does not provide for clear expectations, continuous monitoring and support, or effective evaluation. (6.7)

Building level leadership is a critical factor in the quality of professional development provided. Administrator professional development or mentoring was not documented. (6.7)

Library media specialists are not aware of a master plan to ensure that appropriate LMC resources are available to students as the district changes building grade configurations from K-6 to K-8. (6.8)

**Students do not perceive they are being assisted in their post-secondary endeavors, and individual planning is inconsistently implemented across the district. (6.9)**

**The district has initiated multiple new programs concurrently. This has resulted in frustrated and overwhelmed staff, lack of consistent implementation districtwide, lack of meaningful evaluation of the impact of the programs, and inadequate time for professional development around best practices in instruction. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7)**

**The district is not assessing or addressing the needs of adult learners. (7.6)**

**Data review indicates the district does not have a systematic way of collecting, reporting, and verifying accurate data on students with disabilities. As a result, it appears the usefulness of data for improvement planning may be compromised. This is consistent with all student data collections methods. (7.1)**

**The performance of students with disabilities on the MAP assessment is below State targets in all areas. This is consistent with the performance of all students in the district. (7.1.2)**

5. **According to staff and student focus groups and interviews and district and building AQ data, this district does not consistently provide a safe and orderly environment for learning. (6.6)**

**Ground fault circuit interrupters are missing from many electrical outlets within 6 feet of running water. (8.10)**

**There are no mercury spill procedures and staff has not been trained. (8.11.1)**

**Excess, unidentified, expired, and acutely hazardous chemicals are stored in the science labs. Chemical storage in some labs was not by compatibility families. Complete inventories were not on hand. (8.11.2)**

**Asbestos technical inspection, required every three years, was last done in 2001. (8.11.4)**

**According to student/faculty AQ, team observations, and climate checklists, there is a perception that this district does not provide a safe and orderly environment for students and staff. In some buildings, teachers indicated major concerns about their own safety while at school. (6.6)**

**6. Beyond program implementation, there is little evidence that professional development impacts student achievement and classroom instructional practices. (6.7)**

The district has initiated multiple new programs concurrently. This has resulted in frustrated and overwhelmed staff, lack of consistent implementation districtwide, lack of meaningful evaluation of the impact of the programs, and inadequate time for professional development around best practices in instruction. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.7)

There is little evidence to indicate that the district uses common assessments other than the ones that accompany programs to assess students work and make instructional decisions. (6.2)

When standardized test data are distributed to schools in the district, there is no procedure or common practice in place on how to utilize that data. (6.2)

There was a lack of rigor observed in most classroom instruction. (6.3.1)

Classroom observations indicated very little use of research-based instructional strategies. (6.3.1)

Team observations indicated a lack of differentiated instruction. Staff AQ indicated that they believed that they were adapting instruction, but focus groups indicated that there was not a clear understanding of what differentiated instruction means. (6.3.1)

There is little evidence that current professional development efforts are impacting classroom instruction or student achievement. (6.7)

Teachers indicate that the expectations for participation in professional development activities change yearly as administrators change. District direction is top down, not always data driven, with little teacher input. Professional development is program based rather than teacher driven. (6.7)

Although there is a written professional development plan in place, there is little evidence that the plan is implemented. There is a lack of documentation such as minutes and agendas to prove plan is effective. (6.7)

Library media specialists are not aware of a master plan to ensure that appropriate LMC resources are available to students as the district changes building grade configurations from K-6 to K-8. (6.8)

Students do not perceive they are being assisted in their post-secondary endeavors, and individual planning is inconsistently implemented across the district. (6.9)

**Full implementation of the Comprehensive Guidance Program is impeded by the amount of counselor time involved with Success For All and other duties that prevent counselors from focusing on the guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services, and system support. (6.9)**

**Building level leadership is a critical factor in the quality of professional development provided. Administrator professional development or mentoring was not documented. (6.7)**

**The performance of students with disabilities on the MAP assessment is below State targets in all areas. This is consistent with the performance of all students in the district. (7.1.2)**

**7. The district is out of compliance with federal programs. (7.7)**

**The most recent audit of the district cited numerous audit exceptions. These exceptions would not be present if the district employed a CFO trained in Missouri school finance and accepted auditing principles. (8.6.1-2)**

**The district's Parents as Teachers program is currently serving 28 percent of eligible families, as compared to the state average of 45 percent. (7.5.1)**

**Post-secondary transition plans for students with disabilities are not results oriented. (7.1.4)**

**Eighty staff members are not appropriately certificated for a total of two hundred sixty-two assignments. (73.09 FTE) This total includes seventy teachers, thirty-six of whom have substitute certificates, forty with inappropriate certificates and one with no certificate. This also includes three guidance counselors, four library media specialists, and three administrators, three of whom have substitute certificates and seven with inappropriate certificates.**

**The performance of students with disabilities on the MAP assessment is below State targets in all areas. This is consistent with the performance of all students in the district. (7.1.2)**

**8. There is no evidence that the district evaluates new programs based upon student data or educational research. (8.1)**

The district has developed a plan to evaluate programs and services; however, there is no evidence that the board formally evaluates programs and services on a regular schedule. Therefore, they are not able to take action to ensure that these programs efficiently achieve their goals. (8.1)

Board of Education members do not limit themselves to establishing policies and other activities specifically mentioned in the district's Board of Education Policy Manual. (The policies include but may not be limited to: BBA, BBP, and BDA). Further, board members are involved in implementing the policies and the day-to-day operation of the school district. (8.3)

The Board of Education has created and participates in a committee system that informs board action. The district's administrators make reports to the committees but do not serve on the committees. Resolutions suggested by these committees have been placed on the board's Consent Agenda and passed without due consideration by the board as a whole. This is in violation of the board's Policy BDDDB and Regulation BDDDB-R (8.3) Although there is a written professional development plan in place, there is little evidence that the plan is implemented. There is a lack of documentation such as minutes and agendas to prove plan is effective. (6.7)

The most recent audit of the district cited numerous audit exceptions. These exceptions would not be present if the district employed a CFO trained in Missouri school finance and accepted auditing principles. (8.6.1-2)

There is little evidence to indicate that the district uses common assessments other than the ones that accompany programs to assess students work and make instructional decisions. (6.2)

When standardized test data are distributed to schools in the district, there is no procedure or common practice in place on how to utilize that data. (6.2)

Team observations indicated a lack of differentiated instruction. Staff AQ indicated that they believed that they were adapting instruction, but focus groups indicated that there was not a clear understanding of what differentiated instruction means. (6.3.1)

Current professional development does not provide for clear expectations, continuous monitoring and support, or effective evaluation. (6.7)

Library media specialists are not aware of a master plan to ensure that appropriate LMC resources are available to students as the district changes building grade configurations from K-6 to K-8. (6.8)

**The Comprehensive Guidance Program is not consistently addressing nor evaluating its impact on district Comprehensive School Improvement Plan goals. (6.9)**

**Full implementation of the Comprehensive Guidance Program is impeded by the amount of counselor time involved with Success For All and other duties that prevent counselors from focusing on the guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services, and system support. (6.9)**

**The district has not conducted a community needs assessment regarding the need for additional early education services. (6.4)**

**The district's Parents as Teachers program is currently serving 28 percent of eligible families, as compared to the state average of 45 percent. (7.5.1)**

**Data review indicates the district does not have a systematic way of collecting, reporting, and verifying accurate data on students with disabilities. As a result, it appears the usefulness of data for improvement planning may be compromised. This is consistent with all student data collections methods. (7.1)**

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) FINDINGS**

**PERFORMANCE CONCERNS**

- 1. Student achievement results in grade span 3-5 Mathematics are not high and do not show sufficient improvement. (9.1.1)**
- 2. Student achievement results in grade span 3-5 Communication Arts are not high and do not show sufficient improvement. (9.1.2)**
- 3. Student achievement results in grade span Mathematics 6-8 are not high and do not show sufficient improvement. (9.1.3)**
- 4. Student achievement results in grade span Communication Arts 6-8 are not high and do not show sufficient improvement. (9.1.4)**
- 5. Student achievement results in grade span Mathematics 9-11 are not high and do not show sufficient improvement. (9.1.5)**
- 6. Student achievement results in grade span Communication Arts 9-11 are not high and do not show sufficient improvement. (9.1.6)**
- 7. The percent of graduates scoring at or above the national average on the ACT is not high and does not show sufficient improvement. (9.3)**
- 8. Although the percent of advanced courses taken by juniors and seniors is Met, the status is average, below average, or declining. (9.4.1)**
- 9. Although the percent of career education courses taken by juniors and seniors is Met, the status is average, below average, or declining. (9.4.2)**
- 10. The percent of graduates enrolled in postsecondary education is not high and does not show sufficient improvement. (9.4.3)**
- 11. \*Please explain the difference between 2003 and 2004 in the percent of career education completers placed. (9.4.4)**
- 12. Although the district's graduation rate is Met, the status is average, below average, or declining. (9.5)**
- 13. \*Please enter the following missing attendance/absence data on Screen 14 in the Core Data System: SEE CHART ATTACHED. (9.6)**
- 14. The district's Adequate Yearly Progress subgroup achievement is not high and does not show sufficient improvement. (9.7)**