



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Program Evaluation Questions

1. What is the level of stakeholder satisfaction with communication regarding the Special Non-Public Access Program (SNAP)?
2. What strategies are being taught to students in SNAP?

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:

Special Non-Public Access Program (SNAP)

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation:

Jodie Hay, SNAP Area Coordinator

Date of Evaluation:

January 2005 – June 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

The goals of the Special Non-Public Access Program are to:

- Provide quality special education and related services to eligible students attending non-public schools, with an emphasis on individualized instruction
- Strengthen the communication bond between the Special School District and the private school community

Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:

The SNAP program goals, CSIP goals (Goal 1: Objectives 3 and 8), and MSIP standards (8.1 and 8.2) focus on improving communication/collaboration, developing and implementing a comprehensive staff development plan, and increasing student achievement. The focus of this program evaluation was to determine participant satisfaction with the level of communication and to identify the strategies that teachers/therapists have gained through staff development and implement in SNAP.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Demographic Description of Program:

Locations:

- 32 SNAP sites located in public school buildings in 19 of the 23 school districts in St. Louis County

Number of staff:

- 1 full-time Area Coordinator
- 1 half-time Area Coordinator
- 2 clerical staff
- 111 part-time hourly special education teachers
- 85 part-time hourly speech/language pathologists
- 16 part-time hourly occupational therapists
- 3 part-time hourly physical therapists
- 1 social worker
- 17 part-time hourly teachers/therapists to assist with non-public reactivations, early childhood transition meetings, and speech screenings

Participants:

- 2401 students were serviced through SNAP during the 2004-2005 school year
- 64 students were serviced at their resident school as dual enrollment students

Length of program/service:

SNAP is an after-school program, providing special education and related services to non-public school students. Students attend sessions offered either Mondays/Wednesdays or Tuesdays/Thursdays between the hours of 4:00pm and 7:00pm. Service minutes are determined by an Individualized Services Plan (ISP), but limited to a maximum of 180 minutes per week. Services for non-public students can also be accessed during the school day at the student's resident public school through dual enrollment. Services provided through dual enrollment are also determined by an ISP and limited to 180 minutes per week of special education and related services. During the 2004-05 school year, SNAP services were provided between September 13, 2004 and May 19, 2005.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

SNAP Staff:

Diann Kramolowsky, SNAP Teacher
Jane Lehman, Former SNAP Teacher

Administrators:

LeAnn Bearden, SNAP/Homebound Coordinator

Parent:

Andrea Houle, Parent of SNAP student

Non-Public School Representative:

Colleen Murphy, Learning Consultant, St. Joseph School in Manchester

Chairpersons:

Jodie Hay, SNAP Coordinator
Debbie Smith, Homebound Coordinator

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered:

- √ Staff perception
- √ Perception data
- √ Staff Development Data

IV. Data Collection Methodology:

- √ Parent/Guardian Survey
- √ Non-Public School Survey
- √ Non-Public Representative Survey
- √ SNAP Teacher/Therapist Survey
- √ Student Survey
- √ Attendance Records for Staff Development Inservices



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

V. Results:

Time spent on program evaluation: 104 hours

Strengths of program/service:

- **Parent/Guardian Survey Results**

Approximately 550 SNAP parents/guardians were surveyed and 208 surveys were returned, indicating a return rate of 38%. The parents were asked to respond to 10 yes/no questions. Overall satisfaction rating was 88%. Areas receiving positive ratings of 90% satisfaction and above were:

- Contacted by the SNAP office within 30 days of the eligibility conference
- Questions regarding SNAP were answered by staff
- Positive communication occurred with SNAP teacher
- SNAP teacher attended regularly and arrived on time
- Received notice of ISP meeting in sufficient time

Parents were also asked to comment on the strengths of SNAP. The committee reviewed all the parent comments and categorized their findings into the following themes:

- Personnel**
 - Good teachers and administrative staff
- Instructional process**
 - Small group instruction
 - Support that is not available in the non-public school
- Communication**
 - Timely response to questions
 - Positive communication with SNAP teacher
- Program**
 - Overall positive experience
 - Flexibility in scheduling



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- **Non-public School Survey Results**

Approximately 100 non-public school representatives were surveyed and 47 surveys were returned, indicating a return rate of 47%. Of the 47 surveys returned, 6 were returned with no responses marked. In addition, administrative representatives from the Catholic Education Office, Lutheran Association for Special Education, and Jewish Education Office also completed surveys. The non-public school representatives were asked to respond to 9 questions using the following scale:

- “A - all of the time”
- “M - most of the time”
- “S - some of the time”
- “N – never”

Areas in which 85% or more of the ratings were in the “A – all of the time” and “M – most of the time” categories were:

- Prompt response by SNAP office staff to inquiries
- Prompt response by teachers/therapists to inquiries
- Concerns & problems are addressed in a professional & collaborative manner
- All ISP participants are encouraged to share information
- Positive and productive ISP meetings

Non-public school representatives were also asked to comment on the strengths of SNAP. The committee reviewed all the comments and categorized their findings into the following themes:

- Personnel**
 - Good teachers and administrative staff
- Instructional process**
 - Provide strategic instruction
 - Offer social skill instruction
 - Provide speech/language therapy
- Communication**
 - Frequent contact between SNAP teachers/parents/non-public staff
 - Positive communication with SNAP teacher
- Program**
 - Partnership between professionals



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- **SNAP Teacher/Therapist Survey Results**

100 SNAP teachers/therapists were surveyed and 61 surveys were returned, indicating a return rate of 61%. Participants rated questions with the following scale:

- “A - all of the time”
- “M - most of the time”
- “S - some of the time”
- “N - never”

Areas in which 90% or more of the ratings were in the “A – all of the time” and “M – most of the time” categories were:

- Prompt response by office staff and supervisors to inquiries
- Positive communication with office staff and supervisors
- Effective communication of procedures for completing the ISP and reevaluation

SNAP teachers/therapists were also asked to comment on the strengths of SNAP. The committee reviewed all the comments and categorized their findings into the following themes:

- Personnel**
 - Good support from supervisors and office staff
 - Great students and parents
- Instructional process**
 - Provide small group instruction
 - Emphasis on teaching and individualized instruction
- Communication**
 - Prompt response from supervisor & office staff to questions
 - Good overall communication (parents/teachers/non-public staff/office staff)
- Program**
 - Well-organized program



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- Students attending SNAP

Approximately 150 middle and high school students attending SNAP were surveyed and 56 surveys were returned, indicating a return rate of 37%. The students were asked to respond to 6 yes/no questions. Overall satisfaction rating was 93%. Areas receiving positive ratings of 90% satisfaction and above were:

- Teacher response to questions
- Positive communication with SNAP teacher
- Learning skills that could be applied to daily classwork
- ISP goals explained

The students in SNAP were also asked to comment on the strengths of SNAP. The committee reviewed all the comments and categorized their findings into the following themes:

- Personnel
 - Teachers are great
 - Instructional process
 - Quiet place to get support with homework
 - Program
 - Positive experience
-
- The following were identified by non-public staff as strategies that were taught in SNAP: comprehension skills, paragraph formation, sentence structure, decoding strategies, organizational skills, problem solving skills, test-taking strategies, computational skills, and social skills
 - The following were identified by SNAP teachers/therapists as strategies that were taught in SNAP: study skills (e.g. Skills for School Success), graphic organizers, webbing, networking, KU learning strategies (e.g. paraphrasing, paragraph writing, word identification, visual imagery, self-questioning), writing strategies, proofreading strategies, pre-reading/predicting/using context, SPIRE, visual/perceptual/sensory motor skills, phonological awareness skills, social skills



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Concerns regarding program/service:

- Parents/guardians of students attending SNAP were asked to respond to 10 yes/no questions and 2 short answer questions. The committee reviewed all the responses and comments. The concerns noted most frequently in the areas of communication and strategic instruction were:
 - Need for improved communication between SNAP teacher and non-public school
 - More consistency in receiving copies of quarterly progress
 - Students are completing homework, but not learning specific strategies

- Representatives from the non-public schools were asked to rate their response to 9 questions and reply to 3 short answer questions. The committee reviewed all the responses and comments. The concerns noted most frequently in the areas of communication and strategic instruction were:
 - More consistent communication with SNAP teachers
 - More timely notification of ISP meetings and eligibility conferences
 - Consistency in paperwork requested for ISP meetings
 - Consistent use of the Strategic Tutoring Model

- Teachers/therapists in SNAP were asked to rate their response to 8 questions and reply to 3 short answer questions. The committee reviewed all the responses and comments. The concerns noted most frequently in the areas of communication and strategic instruction were:
 - Availability for consistent communication with the non-public schools
 - Need for additional materials and supplies to do their job
 - Access to computers during SNAP hours
 - Request for the Strategic Tutoring in-service

- Middle school and high school students attending SNAP were asked to respond to 6 yes/no questions and 2 short answer questions. The committee reviewed all the responses and comments. No concerns were expressed in the areas of communication and strategic instruction.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Recommendations regarding program/service:

- Develop systems/procedures to consistently improve communication with our non-public partners
 - Continue to meet with representatives from the non-public community to review and revise (as needed) systems/procedures
 - Devise a standard communication form to utilize in gathering data prior to ISP and/or reevaluation meetings
 - Offer quarterly conferences for parents, non-public representatives, and SNAP teachers/therapists to meet and share student progress
 - Develop a plan to support the needs of non-public staff with the problem solving model

- Continue to promote the use of strategic instruction in SNAP sessions
 - Provide in-service opportunities to staff on strategic instruction (e.g. KU Learning Strategies, Strategic Tutoring)
 - Provide teachers with resources/materials that will encourage strategic instruction

VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as A Result of Program Evaluation

Person responsible to champion action plan:
Jodie Hay, SNAP Area Coordinator

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education:
Share results of this program evaluation with the non-public representatives by September 1, 2005.

Provide updates on recommendations to the non-public representatives by January 13, 2006.

Provide updates on recommendations to the Board of Education and the non-public representatives by June 30, 2006.

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Special School District of St. Louis County
Special Non-Public Access Program (SNAP)
Parent/Guardian Survey
RESULTS 2005

Code: A-Yes, B-No, C-No Response

Percentages based on 208 responses.

1. Were you contacted by the SNAP office within 30 days of the eligibility conference?
 A (91%) B (4%) C (5%)
2. Did we answer any questions you had regarding SNAP?
 A (96%) B (1%) C (3%)
3. Was communication between you and the SNAP teacher positive?
 A (96%) B (1%) C (3%)
4. Does your child's SNAP teacher attend regularly and arrive on time?
 A (98%) B (1%) C (1%)
5. Did you receive quarterly progress reports?
 A (72%) B (20%) C (8%)
6. Did you receive notice of the annual Individualized Services Plan (ISP) meeting in sufficient time?
 A (96%) B (1%) C (3%)
7. Was your child's non-public school invited to the Individualized Services Plan (ISP) meeting?
 A (87%) B (8%) C (5%)
8. Did you receive a copy of the Individualized Services Plan (ISP) within 2 weeks of the meeting?
 A (89%) B (5%) C (6%)
9. Do you feel a need for on-going communication between SNAP teacher and school?
 A (69%) B (27%) C (4%)
10. Is your child being taught specific skills to enhance their academic/behavioral performance?
 A (85%) B (6%) C (9%)



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Special School District of St. Louis County Special Non-Public Access Program (SNAP) Non-Public School Results **RESULTS 2005**

Code: A-all of the time, M-most of the time, S-some of the time, N-never

1. Does the SNAP office staff respond promptly to voice mail, e-mail, & other inquiries?
 A (48%) **M (43%)** **S (9%)** **N (0%)**
Total Responses = 35 No Response = 12 % based on 23 responses

2. Do the SNAP teachers and therapists respond promptly to voice mail, e-mail, & other inquires?
 A (34%) **M (51%)** **S (16%)** **N (0%)**
Total Responses = 39 No Response = 8 % based on 31 responses

3. Are concerns & problems addressed in a professional & collaborative manner?
 A (65%) **M (22%)** **S (11%)** **N (13%)**
Total Responses = 40 No Response = 7 % based on 33 responses

4. Are you invited to Individualized Services Plan (ISP) meetings by the SNAP teacher?
 A (49%) **M (20%)** **S (24%)** **N (7%)**
Total Responses = 41 No Response = 6 % based on 35 responses

5. Do you receive notice of ISP meetings at least 10 days prior to the meeting?
 A (24%) **M (17%)** **S (44%)** **N (15%)**
Total Responses = 41 No Response = 6 % based on 35 responses

6. Are you encouraged to provide input via questionnaire or phone call prior to an ISP meeting?
 A (39%) **M (27%)** **S (24%)** **N (10%)**
Total Responses = 41 No Response = 6 % based on 35 responses

7. Are all ISP participants encouraged to share relevant information?
 A (66%) **B (20%)** **S (7%)** **N (7%)**
Total Responses = 41 No Response = 6 % based on 35 responses

8. Do you feel that the ISP meetings you have attended were positive and productive?
 A (62%) **M (27%)** **S (11%)** **N (0%)**
Total Responses = 37 No Response = 10 % based on 27 responses

9. Do you receive copies of completed ISP's within 2 weeks of the meeting?
 A (30%) **M (40%)** **S (23%)** **N (7%)**
Total Responses = 40 No Response = 7 % based on 33 responses



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Special School District of St. Louis County Special Non-Public Access Program (SNAP) SNAP Teacher/Therapist Survey **RESULTS 2005**

Code: A-all of the time, M-most of the time, S-some of the time, N-never

Percentages based on 61 responses.

1. When you call the SNAP office, are you able to speak directly with someone?
 A (39%) M (51%) S (10%) N (0%)
2. Does the SNAP office staff respond promptly to voice mail, e-mail, & other inquiries?
 A (94%) M (3%) S (3%) N (0%)
3. Does my SNAP supervisor respond promptly to voice mail, e-mail, and other inquiries?
 A (95%) M (3%) S (2%) N (0%)
4. Is communication with the SNAP office staff positive?
 A (90%) M (10%) S (0%) N (0%)
5. Is communication with my SNAP supervisor positive?
 A (94%) M (6%) S (0%) N (0%)
6. Are procedures for completing the Individualized Services Plan (ISP) communicated effectively?
 A (77%) M (18%) S (5%) N (0%)
7. Are procedures for completing re-evaluations communicated effectively?
 A (64%) M (26%) S (10%) N (0%)
8. Do you have the instructional materials & supplies necessary to do your job?
 A (56%) M (29%) S (15%) N (0%)



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Special School District of St. Louis County
Special Non-Public Access Program (SNAP)
Student Survey
RESULTS 2005

Code: A-Yes, B-No, C-No Response

Percentages based on 56 responses.

1. If you had questions, did your teacher answer any questions you had regarding SNAP?
 A (100%) B (0%) C (0%)
2. Is communication between you and your SNAP teacher positive?
 A (100%) B ((0%)) C (0%)
3. Have you learned skills that you could use in your daily classwork?
 A (93%) B (5%) C (2%)
4. Did you participate in your Individualized Services Plan (ISP) meeting?
 A (80%) B ((9%)) C (0%)
5. Were the goals stated in your ISP explained to you?
 A (89%) B (9%) C (2%)
6. Do you attend SNAP regularly?
 A (96%) B (4%) C (0%)