



Special School District

**Special Education Services
Program Evaluation**

Lynne Midyett, Chair

Board Approved: April 10, 2012



Evaluation Results

Goal 1: Meet Missouri State Performance Plan (SPP) for Special Education targets for educational environment

Measureable Objective 1:	The number of partner districts meeting the state target of >59.50% of school age students with disabilities inside the regular class 80% or more of the day will meet or exceed the mean of the past three years. The state performance target has increased from >59.00% in 2007-2008 to >59.50% for 2010-2011.												
<p>Results: Objective met. Mean number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target from 2008 through 2010 = 20 Number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target for 2010-2011 = 20</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th># of Districts</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007-2008</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-2009</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009-2010</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mean 2008-2010</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	# of Districts	2007-2008	20	2008-2009	19	2009-2010	22	Mean 2008-2010	20	2011	20
Year	# of Districts												
2007-2008	20												
2008-2009	19												
2009-2010	22												
Mean 2008-2010	20												
2011	20												

Measureable Objective 2:	The number of partner districts meeting the state target of <10.20% of school age students with disabilities inside regular class less than 40% of the day will meet or exceed the mean of the past three years. The state performance target has increased from <10.80% in 2007-2008 to <10.20% for 2010-2011.												
<p>Results: Objective met. Mean number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target from 2008 through 2010 = 14 Number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target for 2010-2011 = 14</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th># of Districts</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007-2008</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-2009</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009-2010</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mean 2008-2010</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>14</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	# of Districts	2007-2008	13	2008-2009	13	2009-2010	16	Mean 2008-2010	14	2011	14
Year	# of Districts												
2007-2008	13												
2008-2009	13												
2009-2010	16												
Mean 2008-2010	14												
2011	14												

Goal 2: Increase student performance in communication arts and math

Measureable Objective 1:	County-wide the percent of students scoring advanced or proficient on the state-wide assessment (MAP) for communication arts will increase over the mean of the past three years.
--------------------------	---

Results: Objective met.

Mean percent of students in St Louis County scoring at Proficient or Advanced from 2008 through 2011 = 52.8%.

Mean percent of students in St Louis County scoring at Proficient or Advanced in 2011 = 57.1 %

Year	% Proficient or Advanced
2008	48.9
2009	53.9
2010	55.7
Mean 2008-2010	52.8
2011	57.1

Measureable Objective 2:

County-wide the percent of students scoring advanced or proficient on the state-wide assessment (MAP) for mathematics will increase over the mean of the past three years.

Results: Objective met.

Mean percent of students in St Louis County scoring at Proficient or Advanced from 2008 through 2011 = 48.5%.

Mean percent of students in St Louis County scoring at Proficient or Advanced in 2011 = 54.4%

Year	% Proficient or Advanced
2008	47.0
2009	48.4
2010	50.2
Mean 2008-2010	48.5
2011	54.4

Goal 3: Meet Missouri State Performance Plan (SPP) for Special Education targets for graduation and drop-out rates for students with disabilities

Measureable Objective 1:

The number of partner districts meeting the state target for graduation rate of students with disabilities will meet or exceed the mean of the past three years. The state performance target for graduation has increased from 75% in 2008 to 81.20% for 2011.

Results: Objective not met.

Mean number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target from 2008 through 2010 = 18

Number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target for 2011 = 17

Year	# of Districts
2008	22
2009	18
2010	16
Mean 2008-2010	18
2011	17

Measurable Objective 2:	The number of partner districts meeting the state target for drop-out rate of students with disabilities will meet or exceed the mean of the past three years. The state performance target for drop-out rate has increased from <5.00% in 2009 to <4.80% for 2011.
-------------------------	---

Results: Objective met.
 Mean number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target from 2008 through 2010 = 17
 Number of districts in St. Louis County meeting the state performance target for 2011 = 17

Year	# of Districts
2008	18
2009	17
2010	17
Mean 2008-2010	17
2011	17

What do key staff and stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength 1: Majority of students with disabilities across St. Louis County are in regular class 80% or more of the day. Strength 2: Four year trend of improvement for students achieving proficient or advanced in both communication arts and math. Strength 3: Number of districts meeting the state performance target for drop-out rate remains steady with a more rigorous standard for 2011.
<p>Opportunities/Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity 1: Wide variability in the percent of students in regular class less than 40% of the day by partner district. Opportunity 2: Students are not meeting state performance targets for communication arts and math. Opportunity 3: Decreased number of partner districts meeting the state performance target for graduation. The statewide four year adjusted cohort high school graduation rate was new for 2010-2011.

How well aligned are the program’s priorities and processes with the goals of the program?

<p>Aligned with SSD’s current Comprehensive School Improvement Plan-Rolling Plan, as well as, the 2012-2017 Comprehensive School Improvement Plan-Rolling Plan, specifically Goal 1- Student Success.</p> <p>Objectives correspond with summative measures on the 2012-2017 SSD Scorecard.</p>
--

Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.

Should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?

Yes No

If Yes describe change in priorities.

Should goals be changed, added or removed?

Yes No

If Yes describe the changes to goals listed.

Evaluation Implications

General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation

Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other (Specify.)

Action Plan

- Review and monitor partner districts' improvement plans written as a result of not meeting State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for Educational Environment as determined by the Federal Program Review process.
- Design and develop a system of interventions in mathematics and communication arts for students who are not proficient on district assessments.
- Develop and deploy plan to begin systematic transition planning prior to the mandated age of 16.

Cost and Funding Source

All costs associated with this program evaluation report are included in the budget.

2011 Recommendations Updates:

1. Continue use of progress monitoring systems to guide instructional decisions and building of reading skills for students with IEPs in grades 3-5. The goal is for the students' rate of improvement to measure at the 50th percentile. Expand progress monitoring in the area of reading to grades 6-8 in the 2011-2012 school year and establish baseline. Expand progress monitoring in the area of Mathematics in the 2011-2012 school year and establish baseline.
 - **During 2011-2012, progress monitoring has been implemented for 1,609 students, grades 3-5. Students in all grades are close to or exceeding the progress level of the 50th percentile.**
 - **Progress monitoring in reading has been expanded to grades 6 to 8.**
 - **Currently, 900+ teachers are using a progress monitoring system in the area of communication arts.**
 - **During 2011-2012 approximately 200 teachers are using a system to progress monitor math**

2. Provide materials, supports and professional development needed for 70% of special education teachers in partner districts to deploy the "getting started" steps of continuous classroom improvement with fidelity as measured bi-annually.
 - **As of January 2012, 1,176 teacher level staff in the partner districts have been trained, received materials and coaching supports to deploy the first steps of a classroom learning system and 79% of those trained are demonstrating proficiency with at least 50% of the required steps. Additional data will be collected at the end of the school year.**

3. Expand structures and supports for teams to increase proficiency in using data for instructional decisions as evidenced by an overall 20% indication of "in-place" on the annual Progress Monitoring/Data Team Continuum Survey.
 - **2012 Data Team Implementation Continuum Survey indicates that special education teachers in 78% of partner district and SSD schools use progress monitoring and formative assessment often enough to make instructional decisions.**

4. Provide high quality professional development for the implementation of researched based instructional strategies to meet stated student outcomes at 80% as measured annually.
 - **System to collect student outcomes is being developed. At this time data is only available for teacher implementation fidelity.**

5. In the 2011-2012 school year, expand by 20% the number of districts providing alternative programs to assist students in meeting graduation requirements.
 - **Twenty districts have programs to provide students opportunities for credit recovery. This number will increase to twenty-one for the 2012-2013 school year.**

6. Develop structures to provide inclusion education and training to parents, general educators and special educators. Use follow-up survey data to indicate applicability of the information with a goal of being 90% applicable.
 - **Follow-up data is not available. District-wide committee is in process of developing structures.**

7. Increase the number of districts closing the achievement gap in Communication Arts by 20% and in Mathematics by 25% as indicated by 2012 MAP data. Recommended strategies are to monitor districts that have improvement plans for educational placement and replicate strategies being used in districts where the most significant gains are being made. Develop a committee to study districts with high achievement for students with disabilities at the national and international levels looking for trends, patterns and use of high yield strategies and make recommendations for improvements.
 - **Based on 2011 MAP Communication Arts results, nine districts decreased the performance gap. Results for 2010 indicate thirteen districts decreased the gap. Improved results were demonstrated in math with eight districts closing the gap compared to six for 2010 results. District level improvement plans are monitored as part of SSD Comprehensive School Improvement Plan for 2011-2012 and advisory groups are in place to review and share effective strategies for increased student achievement.**

8. By March of 2012, all Directors and /or Area Coordinators will communicate the following recommendations made by the student stakeholder group to partner districts as ways to increase student achievement:
 - Provide a safe and well organized building
 - Provide after school activities
 - Employ teaming approach
 - Separate grade levels
 - Consider changing school start time for optimal learning
 - Provide more choices in classes to meet student interests
 - Provide more time to get ready for the next day
 - **In process**

9. Incorporate the following recommendations made by the student stakeholder group into SSD Professional Development Committee's planning for 2011-2012 as ways to increase student achievement:
 - Keep content interesting and fun
 - Provide direct modeling
 - Provide review activities
 - Connect learning to student interests
 - Teach to the student's learning style
 - Provide feedback to students on learning and achievement
 - **Completed**