



# Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

---

Program Evaluation Question(s) (Revised 10/19/2004)

1. What do services look like for students with language impairment across grade levels throughout St. Louis County?
2. What are nationally recognized best practices for students with language impairments and how does SSD's delivery of services (specifically language classrooms) compare/correlate with these nationally recognized best practices?

## I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:

Language Impaired

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation (list):

Carla Addoh, Area Coordinator of Special Education

Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):

June 2004-Jan. 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

To provide intervention, therapy, and therapy which align with best practices for students eligible for language services.

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

Information gathered will help the Speech-Language staff implement instructional programs designed to meet the assessed needs of its students, as well as the practices and procedures needed to support these programs. (MSIP Standard 6.3)

Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s)

Partner District Buildings  
SSD Building



# Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

---

## Number of staff

1 Director, Julia Burke

4 Effective Practice Specialists (EPSs)

Helen Becker

Jeffery Schneider

Deanna Jester

Casey Wisdom

8 Technical Area Coordinators (Certified Speech-Language)

Barb O'Leary

Carla Addoh

Mitzi Brammer

Lizbeth Moore

Melisa Bohannon

Linda Evans

Mary Lee Shasserre

Christi Gales

The following is the 2003-2004 statistical information for teacher level Speech-Language Pathologist (SLP):

342 SLPs in Partner Districts in itinerant settings

55 SLPs in Speech or Language Classroom settings

25 SLPs in SSD buildings in itinerant settings

1 SLP in Career Training in itinerant setting

-----

Total of 423 Speech-Language Pathologists (K-12)

Statistical information is gathered and analyzed annually for each school year. Next report will be available August 2005.

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

SSD staff--Speech and Language staff throughout St. Louis County

Other: Linda Evans—Area Coordinator South Region

Gayle Hennessey—Director/Liaison Webster Groves

Mitzi Brammer—Area Coordinator North Region

Deanna Jester—EPS North Region

Renee Liebetreu—Special Education Teacher South Region



# Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

---

Melisa Bohannon—Area Coordinator Central Region  
Marylee Shasserre—Area Coordinator West Region  
Adrienne Henderson—Administrative Intern North Region  
Carla Addoh—Area Coordinator North Region  
Mary Lee Burlemann—Intake Coordinator

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

Staff perception  
Teacher Needs Assessment  
Achievement data  
Movement to LRE

### IV. Data Collection Methodology

Statistical Surveys to Staff  
Literature Review  
MAP Analysis  
Student Profile Report  
Annual statistical information is gathered from Speech-Language Pathologists across St. Louis County.  
MAP information was also gathered for language only students.

### V. Results

Time spent on program evaluation (to date)

Approximately 65.5 hours (This time includes: secretarial collation, report writing, committee meetings, literature review, data analysis, training, chairperson collation, and meetings with Program Evaluation Administrator)

Strengths of program/service

⇒ As of 10-27-04, 612 students were identified as having only a Language Impaired only diagnosis in K-12. Of these 612 students, 538 receive language therapy outside the regular education class less than 21% of the time; 45 receive services 21-60% of the time outside the regular education class; and 29 receive services more than 60% of the time outside the regular education class (See Attachment)



# Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- 
- ⇒ Considering that 612 students were identified as only Language Impaired and that the district employs 423 Speech-Language Pathologists, the majority of language services are provided for students with additional special education diagnoses. These students were not considered in this program evaluation, since the focus is on students with a single diagnosis of Language Impaired.
  - ⇒ Students with a single diagnosis of Language receive language intervention across a continuum of service delivery models throughout St. Louis County as recommended by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. In the 2003-2004 school year, there were 55 Speech-Language classrooms throughout the District. Currently, Area Coordinators and SSD School Principals are reporting that all of these Speech-Language classroom teachers are following the district's identified "best practice" of Universal and Sensory Supports.
  - ⇒ Teacher needs assessment information is gathered annually via a survey in order to identify training needs for the Speech-Language Pathologist in an effort to keep them current on language intervention strategies. Trainings included the following: Assessment of African-American Dialect, S-CAT, Fluency, Apraxia of Speech, CELF-4 Training, Literacy K-12.
  - ⇒ Current statistical information regarding students with Speech-Language diagnosis indicates they are moving to a least restrictive or No Service Required status. The statistical information does not delineate speech versus language. Statistics for 2003-2004 indicates the following:
    - ⇒ FOR ITINERANTS-
      - 13959 students were in speech and language therapy during the school year
      - 2421 students on itinerant caseload for speech and language were dismissed as No Services Required
    - ⇒ FOR SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOMS-
      - 430 students were served
      - 74 students changed to a less restrictive level of service



# Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

---

## Concerns regarding program/service

- ⇒ Of the 430 students in the Speech-Language classroom programs during the 2003-2004 school year, the majority of these students had other additional special education diagnoses: 11 Emotionally Disturbed, 98 of Learning Disabled, 17 of Mentally Retarded, 66 with Autism Spectrum Disorder, and 132 with Speech Impaired. 101 were students in language classrooms who did not have a diagnosis of Speech or Language Impaired. The implementations of discipline-specific Speech-Language best practices maybe hindered when students who do not have Speech-Language needs are included in language classroom programs. There is a need to collect data to compare the percentage of students who moved to a lesser restrictive setting with or without a speech or language diagnosis.
- ⇒ Some best practices are currently in place, such as universal and sensory supports, utilizing partner district curriculum, balanced literacy, functional assessment, and behavior intervention plans. However, discipline specific best practices have not been identified, such as phonological awareness or comprehension.
- ⇒ Limited tools are available to assess discipline specific best practice in language programs.
- ⇒ Under the previous data system, Speech and Language students were grouped together and meaningful data for each disability is not available. Historically, students were coded as (SP). There was no delineation of speech versus language.

## Recommendations regarding program/service

- ⇒ Identify discipline specific best practice.
- ⇒ Develop a tool for evaluating discipline specific best practices related to language intervention, which will address the varied needs of students in these language classrooms.
- ⇒ Develop Encore report to assist in the identification of language only students and to pinpoint the spectrum of services.



# **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**

(See Attachment)



# Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

---

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation