



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

I. Program/Service Information

Evaluation Question:

Does the frequency of adaptive physical education (APE) service delivery models (direct, consult, combination) differ across region?

Name of Program or Services:

Adaptive Physical Education, Related Services.

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation (list):

Donna Roettger, Effective Practice Specialist, OT/PT/APE

Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):

January-June 2005.

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

Within the Special School District of St. Louis County, the primary responsibility of the APE staff is to utilize specialized skills and knowledge to work collaboratively with the partner districts in developing and adapting physical education curricula. The purpose is to assure that students with disabilities are afforded (to the fullest extent possible) opportunities to participate safely and successfully in physical education classes/activities along with their non-disabled classmates.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

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

CSIP Goal:

Related Services Goal #1: Improve Student Performance Levels; Objective #8:

Develop and implement a comprehensive staff development plan for all employees;

Strategy #1: Develop and implement a comprehensive staff development plan for all OT/PT/APE staff.

MSIP Standard:

- 6.7 Professional development is an integral part of the educational program and all school improvement initiatives.
- 6.7.1 The district provides intensive, on-going professional development activities that address curriculum and the instructional practices related to student achievement issues identified in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP).

Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s):

Adaptive physical education is a countywide program. APE is defined as a related service under IDEA and is available only when a student has a previously existing special education diagnosis. APE may be added by IEP team decision following evaluation by an APE teacher. This program evaluation covers elementary school age programs only (K-5). Grades K-5 have the largest proportion of school age students receiving adaptive physical education services (comprising approximately 38% of the total number of students K-Age 21 receiving APE services). Grades 6- Age 21 also tend to have fewer students receiving adaptive physical education services with a larger proportion receiving consultative services only.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Physical education is not offered as a curricular option until school age; therefore APE services are not available in the early childhood setting.

Number of staff:

Area Coordinator

Effective Practice Specialists (2)

Secretaries (2; both secretaries serve all three (OT, PT, and APE) departmental programs)

Adaptive P.E. Teachers (18)

Total staff: 23

Participants:

Adaptive physical education services are available- provided the student has an existing special education diagnosis and pending IEP team decision- countywide to any student who requires the service to benefit from special education programming. In the 2004-2005 school year, a total (K-Age 21) of 739 students received some level of adaptive physical education service (263 in the South, 272 in the West, 115 in the Central, and 89 in the North. The Special Education Schools employ their own building P.E. teachers and therefore do not utilize APE teachers.

Length of program/service:

Adaptive physical education services are available throughout each school year. Although not typical, a student may qualify for APE services during the extended school year. There are six primary service delivery models that SSD APE's utilize: (1) direct in the special education setting, (2) direct in the general education setting, (3) direct in both special education and general education settings, (4) direct in special education setting + consult, (5) direct in the general education setting + consult, and (6) consult services only (with no direct component). As the role of the APE is geared towards adaptation of the existing PE curriculum, the ideal setting for this service is direct service (supplemented with a consultative component) in the general education setting. However, if student needs dictate, they are occasionally pulled out into parallel, but separate, groups. Please refer to Appendix A for a graphic depiction of service delivery survey results.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation (check stakeholders utilized):

SSD staff:

Steve Taff, Area Coordinator OT/PT/APE; Donna Roettger, Effective Practice Specialist OT/PT/APE; Teri Toler, Effective Practice Specialist OT/PT/APE; Marty Woytus, Area Coordinator-Rockwood; Kim Buenger, SSD Classroom Teacher/IEP Chairperson- Lindbergh; Joan Marentette and Aimee Kappler, SSD PT's; Tricia Reh, SSD OT; Deb Freund, SSD APE.

Community:

Patti Lavesser, PhD, Professor, Washington University School of Medicine, Program in Occupational Therapy; several parents were invited to participate, but none accepted the offer.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered (check type utilized)

- 1) IEP Data.
- 2) Departmental Monthly Reports.

IV. Data Collection Methodology (examples)

Data was collected from a staff survey (18 adaptive physical education teachers) regarding service delivery models. Teachers gathered information from monthly reports and IEP review. Return rate was 100 %.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- 1) Staff survey- Service delivery models (distributed January 2005; please see Appendix B).
- 2) Document review- Departmental monthly reports (please see Appendix C).
- 3) IEP and classlist analysis (for every student receiving adaptive physical education in the K-5 age group).

V. Results

Time spent on program evaluation:

Approximately 37 hours.

Strengths of program/service:

The majority of students (64.5% average in the South, West, and Central regions) are receiving APE services in the general education setting. Adaptive P.E. services must be delivered directly in the general education setting to maximize student outcomes.

The South region APE's demonstrate the best utilization of a direct-general education and consult combination model (28.3%), which is the ideal for this service.

Concerns regarding program/service:

The North region APE's utilize a disproportionate amount of direct services in the special education setting (21.6%). The other regions average only 6.6% of services delivered in the special education setting alone.

There appears to be a distinct lack (11.6% average for all regions) of utilization of the direct-general education/consult model of service delivery. Without a consultative component to promote follow-up by the general education P.E. teacher, the effectiveness of direct services can be minimized.

Recommendations regarding program/service:

Increase the prevalence of direct (general education)/consult models of service delivery.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Decrease the amount of APE services delivered in the special education-only setting in the North region.

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

Person responsible to champion action plan:

Donna Roettger, Effective Practice Specialist, OT/PT/APE.

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education:

APE's to obtain copies of the appropriate general education PE curricula for planning purposes (including consideration of applicable Show-Me Standards): September 2005.

APE staff to attend consultation/collaboration training: March 2006.

Follow-up survey to North region APE's to determine rationale for increased amount of special education-only services: March 2006.

Explore options to provide training for SSD administrators regarding adaptive physical education and the possible roles APE's assume in supporting student performance: December 2005.

__Donna Roettger____ Date: __8/2/05____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

APPENDIX A

Adaptive Physical Education Standard Program Evaluation Data 2004-2005

(Percentages by Region of students receiving APE)

<u>Codes</u>	<u>Service Settings key:</u>	<u>Regions</u>			
		South	West	Central (Partner Districts)	North
DS	Direct in special education setting	1.4	4.8	13.6	21.6
DG	Direct in general education setting	61.2	67.3	65.1	35.3
DB	Direct in both special ed. and general ed. settings	2.9	7.3	3.1	17.6
DSC	Direct services in special ed. + consult	---	---	---	---
DGC	Direct services in general ed. + consult	28.3	6.1	---	11.8
C	Consult services only	6.2	14.5	18.2	13.7
O	Other (homebound or unique combinations of service type/setting)	---	---	---	---
TG	Total amount of direct services with a general ed/component (DG+DB+DGC)	92.4	80.7	68.2	64.7



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

APPENDIX B

OT/PT/APE PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA

SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL SURVEY

*K-5 ELEMENTARY ONLY

PLEASE FILL OUT THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION AND RETURN THIS SURVEY TO THE OT/PT/APE DEPARTMENT BEFORE FEBURARY 28TH.

NAME:

TITLE:

TOTAL # OF STUDENTS SERVED:

SERVICE SETTING	NUMBER OF STUDENTS
DIRECT- SPECIAL ED. SERVICE ONLY	
DIRECT- GENERAL ED.	
DIRECT- IN BOTH SETTINGS	
DIRECT/CONSULT	
CONSULT ONLY	
OTHER:	

Your total number of students served should match the number of student's column.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

APPENDIX C

SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT OT/PT/APE MONTHLY REPORT

Report for month of: *

Year: *

Submitted by: *

___OT ___PT ___APE

- Please submit report no later than the **2nd** of the following month.
- Please **DO NOT** submit without updated classlist attached to report.
- Please identify program and locations (Homebound, etc.) by district and schools.

SSD BLDG District/School/	# Students On Caseload	New Referrals	Students Dropped	Students Transferred to other staff
TOTALS				

R E F E R R A L S

-Please list new referrals for this month.

NAME	SSD #	DISTRICT	SCHOOL

D I S C O N T I N U E D

REASONS

G = Goals Met

D = Deceased

M = Maximized Benefit

MO = moved out of St. Louis County

- Please list all students who were dropped from services.

NAME	SSD#	DATE	DIST/SCHOOL	G	D	M	MO	OTHER

COMMENTS: *

Name: *

Month: *

EVALUATIONS COMPLETED

REGIONS	INITIAL	SERVICE PROVIDED	SINGLE DIS.	SERVICE PROVIDED	MULTI-DIS (RE-EVAL)	SERVICE CONTINUED	SERVICE ADDED	MEDICAID QUARTERLY Enter how many green sheets you turned in	
CENTRAL								Oct 3, 05	
NORTH								Dec 21, 95	
SOUTH								Apr 3, 06	
WEST								Jun 2, 06	

Comments: *