



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Program Evaluation Questions

- 1. How satisfied are the stakeholders with the level of educational support provided by Special School District?**
- 2. What collaborative efforts are used to facilitate the homebound process?**

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:
Homebound Instruction

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation:
Debbie Smith, Area Coordinator Homebound Instruction

Date of Evaluation
January 2005-June 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

The goals of the Homebound Instruction Program are to:

To provide quality general education, special education and related services to eligible students who are unable to attend school due to medical reasons.

To provide quality general education, special education and related services to eligible students who are unable to attend school due to long-term suspension or expulsion.

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

The Homebound Program goals, CSIP goals (Goal 1: Objectives 3 and 8), and MSIP standards (8.1 and 8.2) are correlated in the communication and collaboration is extremely important to the success of the program and the success of the student while on Homebound. The objective of the Program Evaluation is to determine participant satisfaction in regard to the level of educational support provided through Homebound Instruction and the collaborative efforts used to facilitate the medical homebound process.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Surveys were distributed to parents, students, counselors and liaisons. Survey results were tabulated and the data generated was used to determine the findings of this study.

Demographic Description of Program:

Location:

The Homebound Instruction Program provides special education to all 23 districts in St. Louis County. Homebound Instruction services are provided in the students home or public location (public library). The Special School District has contracts with 19 county districts to provide general education. (Hancock, Webster, Ritenour and Rockwood provide their own homebound services).

Number of Staff:

1 full-time Area Coordinator
1 half-time Area Coordinator
2 full-time secretarial staff
100 part-time hourly special education teachers
5 part-time hourly speech/language pathologists
102 part-time general education instructors

Participants:

The Homebound Instruction department processed 748 requests for services for the 05/06 school year. Eligibility was determined for 642 students and services were arranged through the Homebound department. An additional 106 student applications were processed with no services provided do to being ineligible for services. Examples of students that are not eligible for services would include, students returning to school in less that three weeks, students attending school on a partial day, or students with a medical reason that did not necessitate removal from school.

Length of program/service:

The IEP ultimately determines the type and amount of services provided. Typically students will receive 5 hours of homebound per week. Medical services will be for a minimum of 3 weeks and will



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

last as long as a medical doctor requires confinement to the home. Students that are suspended or expelled will receive services at a neutral public location (public library) for the time determined by their local district. During the 2004-2005 school year services were provided in conjunction with the district calendar in which the student resides. Services were in effect from August 16 – June 10 countywide.

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Homebound Teachers:

Diann Kramolowsky, Homebound Instructor
Jane Lehmann, Homebound Instructor

Administrator:

LeAnn Bearden, Homebound/SNAP Coordinator

Parent:

Cate Hall, Parent of a Homebound student

Partner District Staff:

Trudie Stein, Counselor, Pattonville Senior High School

Chairpersons:

Jodie Hay, SNAP Coordinator
Debbie Smith, Homebound Coordinator

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered:

Staff perception
Perception data

IV. Data Collection Methodology:

Parent/guardian survey
Student survey
School Counselor survey
School District Liaison survey



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

V. Results

Total number of hours spent on program evaluation: 108

Parents, students, counselors and component district liaisons were surveyed to determine the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the level of educational support provided by Special School District. Collaborative efforts used to facilitate the homebound process are also to be identified through the survey process.

PARENTS

Parents returned 80 of the approximate 600 surveys distributed. This was a return rate of 7.5%

Surveys identified the grade level, the type of instruction that occurred; general education or special education, and the level of service, be it fulltime or intermittent homebound. Stakeholders were provided a range of five (5) responses for each question posed:

- A = very satisfied
- B = satisfied
- C = neutral
- D = dissatisfied
- E = very dissatisfied

At the conclusion of each survey, two (2) questions were presented:

- What do you consider strengths of Homebound?
- How could Homebound improve?

The program evaluation committee tabulated responses and reviewed all written statements to determine themes related to strengths and suggested areas of improvement.

The following results are a percentage of “very satisfied” or “satisfied” responses for each question posed in the survey.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Satisfaction was indicated with:

- the level of educational support (87 %)
- quality of instruction (92 %)
- use of instructional time (88 %)
- scheduling/prompt delivery of service (85 %)
- collaborative effort between school and homebound instruction (74 %)

Strength of program/service:

- Quality of teachers
- Keeping the child connected between Homebound and school
- Provides one-to-one instruction

Concerns regarding the program/service as reported by parents:

- Extension of services (more teachers, more hours, more classes, and services to include summer)
- Scheduling due to teacher/parent availability
- School and Homebound communication

COUNSELORS

Counselors returned 103 of the approximate 240 surveys distributed. This was a return rate of 43% surveys distributed.

Counselor Satisfaction was indicated with:

- Communication (49 %)
- Educational support provided by homebound (57 %)
- Satisfaction with the counselor role in the homebound process (57 %)

Strengths of program/service:

- Quality of teachers
- Communication
- Keeping the child connected between home and school
- Homebound process (centralized process)
- Provides for one-to-one instruction



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Concerns regarding program/service as reported by Counselors:

- Communication between the Homebound Instructor and the General Education Teacher
- Extension of services (more teachers, more hours, more classes, and services to include summer)
- Initial face-to-face contact between Homebound teacher, regular teacher and counselor conference to plan for communication, instruction and grading
- Extension of services-more courses

STUDENTS

Students (grades 6 and up) returned 48 of the 580 surveys of the surveys distributed.

Student satisfaction was indicated with:

Educational support (86 %)
Quality of instruction (81 %)
Level of satisfaction with instructional time (81 %)

Strength of program/service:

- Teachers are knowledgeable, friendly, understanding cooperative, patient, compassionate and caring.
- Provides one-one instruction

Concerns regarding program/service as reported by students:

- More course offerings, longer sessions, more days of homebound instruction.

LIAISONS

Liaisons returned 13 of the 23 surveys distributed.

Liaison satisfaction was indicated with:

Overall cost effectiveness of the contractual agreement (77 %)
Quality of instruction and level of educational support (84 %)



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Collaborative effort between the partner district, homebound instruction department and the families served (69 %)

Strengths of program/service:

- Teachers have been excellent with students
- Homebound office has been very responsive and is sensitive to students, family and the local district

Concerns regarding program/service as reported by the Liaisons:

- None

The committee reviewed all survey results and determined a focus or theme for improvement.

Recommendations

The following recommendations regarding program/service include:

1. In order to address the collaborative efforts to facilitate homebound, more communication needs to occur:
 - a. Interview Component District General Education Teachers for ideas to improve the program.
 - b. Schedule in-service for all Partner District Schools regarding homebound procedures.
 - c. Revise Cooperative Effort-Expectation Form to include medical piece. Take revised form to pupil personnel meetings for review and input.
 - d. Develop a Communication Form to enhance direct communication between Homebound and school.
2. Expand the Homebound pool of teachers-advertise in the Post, send notices to the 23 districts to hire retiring teachers.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

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

Person responsible to champion action plan:

Debbie Smith, Area Coordinator Homebound Instruction

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education:

Share results of this program evaluation with the Partner District Liaisons by
September 1, 2005.

Provide updates on recommendations to the Partner District Liaisons by
January 13, 2006.

Provide updates on recommendations to the Board of Education and the Partner
District Liaisons by July 15, 2006.

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation

Special School District of St. Louis County
Homebound Instruction
Parent/Guardian Survey
RESULTS 2005

Code: (A- Elementary, B-Jr. High/Middle School, C-High School)

1. What level of instruction occurred?
A(30%) B(22%) C(48%)

Code: (A- General Education, B-Special Education, C-Both Gen. Ed. and Spec. Ed., D-Unknown)

2. What type of instruction occurred?
A(65%) B(9%) C(25%) D(1%)

Code: (A- Full-time Homebound, B-Intermittent Homebound, C-Unknown)

3. What type of instruction occurred?
A(52%) B(39%) C(9%)

Code: (A- Very Satisfied, B-Satisfied, C-Neutral, D-Dissatisfied, E-Very Dissatisfied)

4. How satisfied are you with the level of educational support provided by Homebound Instruction?
A(68%) B(19%) C(9%) D(3%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (1%)

5. Rate your level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction provided.
A(68%) B(24%) C(5%) D(3%) E(0%)

6. Rate your level of satisfaction with the use of instructional time.
A(68%) B(20%) C(9%) D(3%) E(0%)

7. Rate your level of satisfaction with scheduling and the prompt delivery of service.
A(66%) B(19%) C(10%) D(5%) E(0%)

8. Rate your level of satisfaction with the collaborative effort between school and homebound instruction.
A(49%) B(25%) C(11%) D(7%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (8%)

What do you consider strengths of Homebound?

How could Homebound improve?

Optional: _____
Parent/Guardian Child's Name Date

Optional: _____
Homebound Teacher (s)

Special School District of St. Louis County
Homebound Instruction
Counselor/Contact Survey
RESULTS 2005

Code: (A- Elementary, B-Jr. High/Middle School, C-High School)

1. What level of instruction occurred?

A(53%) B(17%) C(21%) NO RESPONSE (9%)

Code: (A- Often, B-Occasionally, C-Never)

2. During the current school year, how frequent was your communication with the Homebound Instruction office?

A(9%) B(57%) C(23%) NO RESPONSE (11%)

Code: (A- Very Satisfied, B-Satisfied, C-Neutral, D-Dissatisfied, E-Very Dissatisfied)

3. How satisfied were you with that communication?

A(29%) B(25%) C(23%) D(3%) E(1%) NO RESPONSE (19%)

4. How satisfied are you with the level of educational support provided by Homebound Instruction?

A(30%) B(27%) C(23%) D(1%) E(2%) NO RESPONSE (17%)

5. As a pivotal member of this collaborative team*, how satisfied are you with your role/responsibility?
(*see attached; Homebound Expectations-A Cooperative Effort).

A(31%) B(35%) C(16%) D(4%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (14%)

What are the strengths of Homebound?

How could Homebound improve?

Optional: _____
Counselor/Contact School Date

Special School District of St. Louis County
Homebound Instruction
Student Survey
RESULTS 2005

Code: (A- Elementary, B-Jr. High/Middle School, C-High School)

1. What level of instruction occurred?
A(8%) B(31%) C(61%)

Code: (A- General Education, B-Special Education, C-Both Gen. Ed. and Spec. Ed., D-Unknown)

2. What type of instruction occurred?
A(73%) B(6%) C(17%) D(2%) NO RESPONSE (2%)

Code: (A- Full-time Homebound, B-Intermittent Homebound, C-Unknown)

3. What type of instruction occurred?
A(71%) B(19%) C(6%) NO RESPONSE (4%)

Code: (A- Very Satisfied, B-Satisfied, C-Neutral, D-Dissatisfied, E-Very Dissatisfied)

4. How satisfied are you with the level of educational support provided by Homebound Instruction?
A(63%) B(23%) C(10%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (4%)

5. Rate your level of satisfaction with the quality of instruction provided.
A(60%) B(21%) C(15%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (4%)

6. Rate your level of satisfaction with the use of instructional time
A(60%) B(21%) C(15%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (4%)

What are the strengths of Homebound?

How could Homebound improve?

Optional: _____
Name Homebound Teacher Date

Special School District of St. Louis County
Homebound Instruction
Liaison Survey
RESULTS 2005

Code: (A- Often, B-Occasionally, C-Never)

1. During the current school year, how frequent was your communication with the Homebound Instruction office?

A(23%) B(69%) C(0%) NO RESPONSE (8%)

Code: (A- Very Satisfied, B-Satisfied, C-Neutral, D-Dissatisfied, E-Very Dissatisfied)

2. How satisfied were you with that communication?

(informative, courteous, prompt reply)

A(61%) B(23%) C(8%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (8%)

3. How satisfied are you with the overall cost effectiveness of your district's contractual agreement with Homebound Instruction and with the provision of homebound instruction by Special School District?

A(38%) B(39%) C(15%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (8%)

4. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of instruction and level of educational support provided by Homebound Instruction to your district?

A(38%) B(46%) C(8%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (8%)

5. As a stakeholder in this process, what is your level of satisfaction with the collaborative effort between your district, the homebound Instruction Department, and the families served?

A(46%) B(23%) C(23%) D(0%) E(0%) NO RESPONSE (8%)

Comments or suggestions:

Optional: _____
Liaison District Date