



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

---

### Program Evaluation Question(s)

What percentage of preschool age children with Individual Education Plans, in Special School District's Early Childhood Special Education Program, demonstrate growth in (a) social emotional skills, (b) acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and (c) the ability to take action to meet their needs?

### I. Program/Service Information

1. Name of Program or Services: Early Childhood Special Education
2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program (list): Martha Disbennett, Director ECSE
3. Demographic Description of Program:
  - Location(s) Affton, Bayless, Brentwood, Hancock, Jennings, Ladue, Lindbergh, Maplewood-Richmond Heights, Normandy, Parkway, Ritenour, Riverview Gardens, Valley Park, Webster Groves, Wellston
  - Number of staff: 288
  - Participants: 1248 preschool children ages 3-5
  - Length of program/service: Maximum 3 years per student.
4. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):  
June 2005-June 2007
5. Goal/Objective of Program/Services:  
The goal of the early childhood special education program is to identify preschool age children with educational disabilities and provide special education and related services in the least restrictive environment.
6. Relationship between ECSE program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:  
Information gathered via the ECSE program evaluation will facilitate the department's ability to accomplish the following:
  - (1) Assess student data, teacher feedback, and parental feedback so that improvement strategies may be developed and implemented (CSIP, Goal I, objective 1).
  - (2) Assess what percentage of children who received services through the ECSE Department fall in the "progressing" category on the DESE ECSE outcome measure upon exit from the program (CSIP, Goal I, objective 2).



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

---

- (3) Assess the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved (a) positive social-emotional skills, (b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and (c) use of behaviors to meet their needs (SPP 7.1.2).

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

- Staff perception\_\_
- Assessment statistics\_\_
- Financial data\_\_
- Attendance rate\_\_
- Dropout rate\_\_
- Suspension rate\_\_
- Expulsion rates\_\_
- Participation rate in co-curricular/extracurricular\_\_
- College/vocational attrition rates\_\_
- Student attitude and interest survey\_\_
- Longitudinal performance data\_\_
- Achievement data\_x\_
- Perception data\_x\_
- IEPs\_\_
- Movement to LRE\_\_
- Other (list): \_\_

### III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Name of committee member and his/her role or title:

Lee Bascom-ECSE Social Worker

Jane Benson-Parent

Gina Bundt-Ritenour Kindergarten Teacher

Tracy Brangle-ECSE Staff Development Facilitator

Kay Castello-ECSE classroom teacher

Debbie Cooper-Riverview Gardens Preschool Teacher

Laurie Corners-ECSE Itinerant Teacher

Jennifer Cunnane-Parent

Brenda Deakin-ECSE EPS-OT/PT

Martha Disbennett-ECSE Director

Mary Dunn-ECSE Speech Pathologist

Suzanne Falvey-Head Start Disability Coordinator

Gina Galligar-ECSE Area Coordinator

Chris Gardiner-ECSE Area Coordinator

Lisa Gilbertson- ABA Coordinator

Susan Harrman-ECSE Itinerant Teacher

Marilee Ingoldsby-ECSE Area Coordinator



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

---

Karen Jones-ECSE Itinerant Teacher  
Mary Beth Krull-ECSE Diagnostic Teacher  
Angela Mueller-First Steps Transition Facilitator  
Margaret Russell-ECSE Occupational Therapist  
Nancy Sexton-ECSE Area Coordinator  
Lila Schmitz-ECSE Diagnostic Teacher, Head Start Liaison  
Nancy Tumbrink-ECSE Area Coordinator  
Ellen Yates-ECSE Speech Pathologist  
Julie Wuch- Assistant EC Director, Webster Groves

Stakeholder meetings were conducted on January 4<sup>th</sup> and May 21<sup>st</sup> to get input into the goal to be evaluated, how to gather information, and to review the outcomes. Recommendations for action plans were developed at the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

### IV. Results

The achievement outcome data the ECSE Program Evaluation committee collected for this evaluation period included information from an ECSE Department Developmental Skills Curriculum Checklist (Appendix 1), the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet – Early Childhood (Appendix 2), a Literacy Skills Checklist (Appendix 3), and the Hodson Computerized Assessment of Phonological Patterns (Appendix 4). The Committee also utilized parent surveys (Appendix 5) and teacher surveys (Appendix 6) to assess perceptions of student progress.

### Achievement Data

#### Developmental Skills Curriculum Checklist (DSCC)

The Developmental Skills Curriculum Checklist (DSCC) was created by the ECSE Program Evaluation Committee three years ago to measure progress of the children in our classrooms. The committee used the Brigance Inventory of Early Development as a basis for skills that teachers would look for when determining progress of children in their classroom. The DSCC measures skills in children from birth to age 6. It consists of four developmental domains that are aligned with the Missouri Pre-K standards as well as Project Construct indicators. The Sociomoral Domain evaluates a child's ability to develop and maintain relationships with peers and adults, and develop skills necessary to participate in a group. The Representation Domain evaluates a child's communication skills in preacademic activities as well as play and real life situations. The Cognitive Domain evaluates problem solving skills, concepts, and rote preacademic skills. The Physical Domain evaluates fine and gross motor skills as well as some adaptive/safety skills. The DSCC checklist uses a point system which allows the student to receive 2 points for a skill that is consistently demonstrated, 1 point for an emerging skill, and 0 points if the skill is not present. A "not applicable" rating is used for skills that are not expected for the student at the time of administration. The number of points possible within each domain varies and is as follows: Sociomoral 0-176 points, Representation 0-202 points, Cognitive 0-150 points, and Physical 0-282 points. Assessment data can be evaluated per child, per classroom



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

teacher, and for the entire program. The checklist is administered at entry into the ECSE program, in the fall for returning students, in the spring, and at exit from the ECSE program. Children who did not have at least 6 months of intervention were not included in the data. Outcome data from the DSCC for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Developmental Skills Curriculum Checklist (DSCC)

		Domain (2004-2005)	n	Pretest	Posttest	t
		Cohort A	Year 1	Sociomoral	111	62.44
Representation	116			80.41	99.99	11.94**
Cognitive	117			30.36	43.33	8.47**
Physical	114			130.48	152.98	11.41**
Year 2	Domain (2005-2006)					
	Sociomoral		107	73.45	90.51	10.66**
	Representation		112	98.77	123.89	10.34**
	Cognitive		113	40.81	68.21	11.66**
Cohort B	Year 1	Domain (2005-2006)				
		Sociomoral	316	61.01	77.94	20.92**
		Representation	305	81.68	105.20	21.09**
		Cognitive	310	30.61	50.86	21.14**
		Physical	303	138.70	163.26	3.35*

Note: \*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .001$

As noted in Table 1, Cohort A students were first assessed in 2004-2005 and assessed again in 2005-2006 during their second year in the program. Analysis of Cohort A data indicates significant student growth in all areas during both the first and second year in the program. Cohort B students were first assessed in 2005-2006 upon entry to the program. Pretest scores were similar to those obtained by Cohort A during their first year in the program. Analysis of Cohort B data also indicates significant student growth in each developmental domain for the year.

### Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS)

The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) is an instrument developed in 2006 by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) for the purpose of measuring outcomes for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities. The MOSS is designed to provide a synthesis of developmental information and represents a standardized document statewide for reporting outcome data to DESE as a component of Missouri Part C State Performance Plan. The MOSS requires a global rating of a child's current functioning compared to same-aged peers in 3 developmental areas which are (a) positive social-emotional



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

skills, (b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and (c) use of appropriate behavior to meet needs. The MOSS must be completed for a child upon entry to an ECSE program and again upon exit from the program. Staff provide ratings of the child’s functioning based on a variety of information such as (a) review of existing data, (b) screening information, (c) interviews with parents, (d) observations, and (e) evaluation/assessment results. Ratings range from 1 (low) to 5 (high) and represent a summary of the frequency and consistency of the three outcome behaviors. Ratings of 1 indicate the skill is not displayed or attempted and suggests significant delay. Conversely, ratings of 5 indicate the skill is displayed in all situations and is age-appropriate. MOSS data is reported to DESE at the end of each school year.

During the 2006-2007 school year 60 children exited the SSD ECSE program with an average enrollment of approximately 7 months. Ratings for “Positive Social-Emotional Skills” and “Acquisition / Use of Knowledge and Skills” were available for all children. Ratings for “Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Needs” were available for 59 of the 60 children. Pre and post MOSS ratings for this group of children are reported in Table 2. The percentage of children who maintained or improved/progressed in their skills is reported in Table 3.

Table 2. MOSS Ratings for Students Exiting ECSE

MOSS Developmental Skill Area	n	Pretest	Posttest	t
Positive Social-Emotional Skills	60	3.23	4.03	7.76*
Acquisition / Use of Knowledge and Skills	60	3.30	4.03	8.28*
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Needs	59	3.80	4.37	5.75*

Note: \*  $p < .001$

Table 3. Percentage of Students Maintaining and Improving Skills (MOSS)

MOSS Developmental Skill Area	Improved		Maintained	
	n	%	n	%
Positive Social-Emotional Skills	35	58.3	25	41.7
Acquisition / Use of Knowledge and Skills	38	63.3	22	36.7
Use of Appropriate Behavior to Meet Needs	31	52.5	28	47.5

As noted in Table 2, analysis indicates a significant gain in MOSS ratings during the course of the school year. MOSS ratings for the majority of children exiting ECSE had improved at the time of exit, whereas other children maintained MOSS ratings consistent with their entry assessment (Table 3). With regard to children who maintained MOSS exit ratings consistent with their entry ratings (i.e., Maintain group), the majority of the group (i.e., 50-78%) had achieved MOSS ratings of 5 on their entry assessment. Thus, there was no opportunity to demonstrate improvement as assessed by the MOSS.



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

### Literacy Growth Checklist

The ECSE Department piloted an Animated Literacy Curriculum beginning in January 2006 with a group of 5 teachers and speech pathologists. The pilot was expanded in the fall of 2006 to 12 teachers and speech pathologist as teachers and administrators saw the positive effects of the curriculum on students. The children in the pilot consisted of IEP students and non-IEP peer model students in our integrated ECSE classrooms. A literacy skill checklist was used pre and post to determine the efficacy of the program. The Literacy Growth Checklist consists of 19 literacy behaviors/skills (e.g., labels objects in books, answers questions about stories, identifies letters of the alphabet, etc.). The items were pulled from the Missouri Pre-K Literacy Standards. The rating was similar to that of the Developmental Skills Curriculum Checklist with a score of 2 indicating the student demonstrates the skill and 1 indicating the skill is inconsistent/emerging. There are a total of 38 points possible. The Literacy Growth Checklist was administered prior to initiating the Animated Literacy Curriculum through observation and structured clinical tasks. After 4 months of intervention in 2006 a post-test was administered to the same group of children. The same procedure was followed for the 2006-2007 school year with the average time for intervention increasing to 7 months. Results of the Literacy Growth Checklist assessments are reported in Table 4.

Table 4. ECSE Student Literacy Growth Checklist

School Year	Dates of Implementation	Student Group	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Average Increase	t
05-06	January – May	IEP	27	23.85	29.81	5.96	8.18**
		No IEP	13	33.00	36.38	3.38	3.91*
06-07	October – May	IEP	148	20.39	29.14	8.74	20.98**
		No IEP	66	27.15	34.33	7.18	10.42**

Note: \*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .001$

Analysis of the Literacy Growth Checklist data indicated significant growth for students with and without disabilities (Table 4). Students with disabilities exhibited slighter larger gains compared to nondisabled peers. Although nondisabled peers received significantly higher scores compared to students with disabilities, the magnitude of difference between the groups did diminish.

### Hodson Computerized Assessment of Phonological Patterns (HCAPP)

During the 2006-2007 school year the ECSE program in Parkway started a program for children with severe speech intelligibility. It was determined to use the HCAPP to measure progress for children in the program. The HCAPP is an assessment designed for preschool and school-age children with speech disorders. The HCAPP enables the analysis of children’s disordered phonological systems and documentation of their progress. The HCAPP was used prior to the start of therapy and again at the end of the school year. The HCAPP is scored on a scale of



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

1-200, with the lower the score the better (i.e., percent of error is scored). A score of 1-49 indicates the “mild” range of severity, 50-99 indicates the “moderate” range of severity, 100-149 indicated the “severe” range and 150-200 indicates the “profound” range. There were 45 students served in the program with 41 having pre and post HCAPP assessments. Data for the HCAPP assessment is reported in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5. Pre and Post HCAPP Scores: Initial vs. End of Year Evaluations

Number of Students	Mean HCAPP Pretest	Mean HCAPP Posttest	Mean Change	<i>t</i>
41	98.71	56.46	42.24	10.26*

Note: \*  $p < .001$

Table 6. HCAPP Severity Category Distribution: Initial vs. End of the Year Ratings

HCAPP Severity Rating	Initial Evaluation		End of Year Evaluation	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Mild	4	9.8	21	51.2
Moderate	22	53.7	13	31.7
Severe	8	19.5	5	12.2
Profound	7	17.1	2	4.9

As noted in Table 5, analysis of the HCAPP assessment data indicates a significant decrease in the frequency of phonological processing errors over the course of the year. As a result, the end of year distribution of students classified at various severity levels changed significantly,  $\chi^2$  (df = 3) = 80.25,  $p < .001$ . The proportion of students classified as having moderate to profound speech problems diminished significantly (Table 6).

### Perception Data

All parents of children in the ECSE program were mailed a survey. Approximately 900 parent surveys were mailed with 301 returned resulting in a 33% return rate. Parents were asked to rate their perception of their child’s progress in the three areas relating to the ECSE program evaluation question. Surveys were also given to General Education Preschool Teachers who had children in their classrooms receiving special education services from itinerant ECSE staff. Approximately 332 teacher surveys were sent with 110 returned resulting in a 33% return rate. If a teacher had more than one student in her classroom receiving services, individual surveys were filled out for each child. Teachers were asked the same questions as the parents regarding their perceptions of how students with IEPs in their classroom were progressing. The results are reported in Table 7.



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

---

Table 7. Comparison of Parent/General Education Teacher Perception Data Surveys

Survey Statement	Parent Response (n=301)	Teacher Response (n=110)
I am aware of my child's/student's needs addressed in the IEP	98% agree or strongly agree	98% agree or strongly agree
I have observed an increase in the child's/student's social relations	86% agree or strongly agree	88% agree or strongly agree
I have observed an increase in my child's/student's use of knowledge and skills	87% agree or strongly agree	94% agree or strongly agree
I have observed an increase in my child's/student's ability to take action to meet needs	84% agree or strongly agree	93% agree or strongly agree

In general, the results of both surveys indicated positive perceptions of preschool children with IEPs progress in the ECSE program. A relative weakness was noted in the parents' perception of their child's progress in taking action to meet needs.

### 1. Strengths of program/service

The outcome data from the ECSE Developmental Skills Curriculum Checklist (DSCC) indicated significant growth related to students' social skills (Sociomoral Domain), communication skills (Representation Domain), preacademic skills (Cognitive Domain), and motor/adaptive skills (Physical Domain). Significant gains were noted for both first-year and second-year students.

Data from the MOSS assessment also indicated the majority of children exiting the ECSE program had significantly improved or maintained a high level of positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behavior to meet needs.

The results of the Literacy Growth Checklist indicated significant growth in the acquisition of pre-literacy skills for children with and without IEPs. Anecdotally, the parents and staff have been encouraged by the success of the students and their interest in the program. Parents have reported to teachers an increase in their child's interest in looking at books and often sang and talked about their Animated Literacy character.





# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

---

The results of the HCCAP assessment indicated significant growth in skill acquisition for those students experiencing phonological processing problems. As a result of the gains achieved, eight students required a less intensive level of service. Comments from the parents indicated they saw progress with their child as well as positive reactions from their child to the program.

Survey data indicate strong agreement among parents and teachers with regard to (a) being aware student needs, (b) observing an increase in student social relations, (c) observing an increase in student use of knowledge and skills, and (d) observing an increase in student ability to take action to meet needs. In general all of the comments were positive from both the parent surveys and the general education preschool teacher surveys. Responses ranged from 84-98% agreeing or strongly agreeing that the children in the ECSE program made progress.

### **2. Concerns regarding program/service**

The results of the parent perception data indicate that 1-3% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their child made progress related to (a) social emotional skills, (b) acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and (c) taking action to meet needs. A review of additional comments on the survey revealed no comments from parents indicating they believed their child had made no progress. The Program Evaluation committee reviewed the results of the parent surveys and hypothesized that the percentage of responses that were “disagree” or “strongly disagree” could be due to a child not receiving service in that area. Parents who responded with “neutral” in response to the 3 evaluation areas ranged from 5-8% with the highest percentage pertaining to the question about taking action to meet needs (i.e., physical skills). This percentage also could be due to a child not receiving services in some of those areas.

Responses from the General Education Preschool Teachers indicated that 1% of the respondents marked “disagree” or “strongly disagree” in response to observing student progress in the 3 evaluation areas. An additional 1-6% marked neutral in response to their observation of progress. A review of comments on the survey revealed no comments related to lack of student progress. Again it is felt that these ratings could reflect the services the students are receiving.

In reviewing the comments from each survey, the one comment strand that was pervasive among parents and teachers was the need for more information on how to work with their child/student.



# ECSE

## Standard Program Evaluation

---

### 3. Recommendations regarding program/service

Based on our program evaluation the following changes to the ECSE program are recommended:

1. Expand on the Animated Literacy program to all ECSE classrooms.
2. Explore and implement a preschool math curriculum due to the success of the Animated Literacy program.
3. Review individual teacher score sheets to determine if there is a significant difference between domains within a classroom that would help to determine staff development needs.
4. Establish a simple system for teachers to give parents suggestions for home activities.
5. Increase communication between parents and staff especially as it relates to providing them with strategies to help them work with their child.
6. Explore opportunities to create collaborative staff development with partner districts in order to address the needs of parent and children with disabilities.

Person responsible to champion action plan:

Martha Disbennett-Director, ECSE

ECSE Program Evaluation Work Committee Members

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education:

1<sup>st</sup> Update: January 2008

2<sup>nd</sup> Update: June 2008

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation**