



Coordinator Name Cathy Dutcher

Planning Team Kelly Krussel, Kelly Grigsby, Marsha Myers, Wendy Owens, Randy Barnes, Dr. Kathy Boyd Fenger and Wendy Pickula.

Program Description

Summary Description of Program

I.E.P. teams determine the level of service a student requires to receive a free and appropriate public education. Special School District has contracts with seven agencies approved by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to provide services if the I.E.P. team determines a student requires an intensive therapeutic program due to emotional needs or a specialized program not offered in partner districts or in Special School District schools.

Purpose or Mandate

The purpose of the POS program is to provide intensive therapy, services, and academic instruction in a safe environment that is more therapeutic than is available in a public school setting.

Which specific CSIP/MSIP goals does this Program support?

Objective 1.1 Ensure achievement for all students.

Who are the Customers/Stakeholders?

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parents | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrators |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Board of Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Taxpayers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Purchase of Service Agencies | |

What are the Customer/Stakeholder requirements?

Customers require that students receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). For some students who require an environment that provides therapy and teaches coping skills in order to have more academic success, appropriate behavior to be able to access supports in the community that they may need.

What is this program expected to accomplish?

The program is expected to provide therapeutic interventions and instruction in coping skills so that the students can experience success in a less restrictive environment.

Briefly describe how this Program works

The program begins when an IEP team has determined that they are unable to meet the needs of the student in a lesser restrictive environment utilizing all services, supports and accommodation available to the team. If the student does not show progress with the highest tier of services, support, and accommodations available in the school, then an IEP decision on change of placement is made. SSD staff in partners district may refer students to separate public schools or separate private schools. Public Separate schools may refer students to Private separate schools if all intervention options have been exhausted. Families may also request an IEP meeting to consider a more restrictive level of service.

Upon referral to a separate private school or purchase of service (POS) agency the student goes through an intake and orientation process involving assessment of functioning, interviews and goal setting. Therapeutic services and coping skill building involves getting "buy-in" from the students and families. Academic instruction is provided to the students. If sufficient progress in changing behavior and overcoming barriers that led to placement in the POS agencies, then the student may return to a less restrictive environment.

What resources (type and quantity) are required to execute this plan?

At each step of the referral process, therapeutic support, family support and additional supervision in the case of aggressive students can help the student remain in a less restrictive environment. On referral to the POS agencies funding is required to purchase services. Family engagement is needed for most behavioral changes in the POS agencies. Currently only 14 of 91 students in purchase of service agencies are under the supervision of the Children's Division.

Action Plan Summary

2014-2015 Overall Goals

Goal 1: Students will progress academically.

Goal 2: Describe the characteristics of the POS agencies

Expected Measurable Outcomes

- 1.1 STAR scores* for Reading will improve from beginning of the year.
- 1.2 STAR scores for Math will improve from beginning of year.
- 1.3 90% of students will have attendance of 90% or higher at each agency.
- 1.4 MAP Performance Index (MPI*) will improve from year to year.

- 2.1 Descriptive. Percent of students attending POS agencies who are also in residence at the agency and whose residential costs are paid by Adoption Subsidy*, Division of Family Services, or Department of Mental Health.
- 2.2 Descriptive. Percent of students at each agency who are referred from SSD.
- 2.3 Descriptive. Percent of students attending POS agencies by disability.
- 2.4 Percent majority and minority of SSD students in POS agencies.
- 2.5 Percent male and female of SSD students in POS agencies.
- 2.6 Percent of students eligible for Free or Reduced lunch of SSD students in POS agencies.

Evaluation Plan Summary

Program Evaluation Authority

This program evaluation is required by the Board of Education of SSD.

Qualitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used

- What are the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
- How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
- What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?
- How well-aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?
- What is the level of deployment of this program's services?
- How should resources be changed to improve this program?
- How should goals be changed, added, or removed?

Quantitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used

- What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?
- What are the actual costs of this program?
- What is the estimated actual benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness of this program?

***Operational Definitions:**

Adoption Subsidy refers to a fund provided by the North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC).

MAP Index scores refer to an indicator of achievement for a group of students which gives relative weight to students in each category from below basic to advanced. The index ranges from 100 to 500 with a higher score meaning that more students scored in higher categories.

STAR scores refer to scores on the STAR Renaissance Assessments developed and provided through Renaissance Learning. STAR scores include scale and grade equivalent scores in Reading and Mathematics.

Purchase of Service I

2014-2015 Program Evaluation Report

Special School District



Coordinator Name Cathy Dutcher

Planning Team Kelly Krussel, Kelly Grigsby, Marsha Myers, Wendy Owens, Randy Barnes, Dr. Kathy Boyd Fenger and Wendy Pickula.

Evaluation Summary

Purpose or Mandate

The purpose of the POS program is to provide intensive therapy, services, and academic instruction in a safe environment that is more controlled than is available in a public school setting.

Program Description

I.E.P. teams determine the level of service a student requires to receive a free and appropriate public education. Special School District has contracts with seven agencies approved by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to provide services if the I.E.P. team determines a student requires an intensive therapeutic program due to emotional needs or a specialized program not offered by the partner districts or by Special School District.

What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?

Students made academic progress in Reading and Mathematics as measured by the STAR assessment program which is being implemented consistently at each agency. This consistent implementation provides a way to measure student progress as it is measured in SSD schools. The program provides intensive therapeutic interventions to students.

How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?

Inadequate Approaching Satisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?

Since the POS agencies serve students with the greatest therapeutic challenges, academic progress sometimes is secondary to therapeutic supports. Also, the POS student population fluctuates from year to year so year to year comparisons may be misleading. Agencies are providing increasing academic supports, but these supports are not fully implemented as in SSD schools.

Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?

Goal 1: Students will progress academically.

Measurable Objective 1:	1.1 STAR scores* for Reading will improve from beginning of the year. Only students with a pretest and posttest were included in the results.		
Results: Met. 72.7% of students with a pretest and posttest improved or were in the highest category.			
	N	Number improved	Percent Improved
	33	24	72.70%

Measurable Objective 2:	1.2 STAR scores for Math will improve from beginning of year. Only students with a pretest and posttest were included in the results. Students who were in the highest grade category, grade 13, were counted as improved since there was little room for improvement.		
Results: Met. 51.5% of students with a pretest and posttest improved in Math.			
	N	Number improved	Percent Improved
	33	17	51.50%

Measurable Objective 3:	1.3 90 percent of students will have attendance of 90 percent or higher at each agency. The total students reported in the table below include all students who were enrolled in the POS agencies at any point in the school year since this number is what DESE uses to calculate proportional attendance.				
Results: Not met. The overall proportional attendance rate of students with attendance over 90% was 64%.					
	School	Total Students	Full Time Enrollment Equivalent*	FTE over 90%	Proportional Attendance*
	Center for Autism	2	1.5	1.5	100.0%
	Edgewood	37	22.7	12.9	57.0%
	Epworth	15	7.8	4.4	56.7%
	ECH	17	9.6	5.2	53.8%
	Giant Steps	6	3.5	2.4	67.7%
	Logos	19	12.4	9.7	78.4%
	Marygrove	8	5.0	4.4	88.2%
	POS Total	104	62.6	40.6	64.8%

Measurable Objective 4:	1.4 MAP Performance Index (MPI*) will improve from year to year.							
Results: Not met. The MPI scores fell from 2013 to 2014 in both English Language Arts and Mathematics.								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">English Language Arts</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>238.9</td> <td>190.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			English Language Arts		2013	2014	238.9	190.3
English Language Arts								
2013	2014							
238.9	190.3							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Mathematics</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>181.3</td> <td>164.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Mathematics		2013	2014	181.3	164.3
Mathematics								
2013	2014							
181.3	164.3							

Goal 2: In order to gain a better understanding of the POS agencies and the relationship SSD has with them descriptive characteristics of the POS agencies will be included. These objectives cannot be “Met” in the same way that other objectives are met, but are meant to provide a deeper understanding of the POS process.

Measurable Objective 1:	2.1 Descriptive. Percent of students attending POS agencies who are also in residence at the agency and whose residential costs are paid by Adoption Subsidy*, Division of Family Services, or Department of Mental Health.					
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Supported Students</th> <th>Percent Supported</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>14.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Supported Students	Percent Supported	13	14.3%
Supported Students	Percent Supported					
13	14.3%					

Measurable Objective 2:	2.2 Descriptive. Percent of students at each agency who are referred from SSD. The total student number reported here is based on active students in January when the data were pulled from the database. This total is different from the total reported to DESE in the MOSIS October cycle.																																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Agency</th> <th>SSD Students</th> <th>Total Enrollment</th> <th>Percentage SSD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Center of Autism</td> <td>2</td> <td>39</td> <td>5.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Edgewood Children’s Home</td> <td>34</td> <td>226</td> <td>15.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Epworth</td> <td>7</td> <td>71</td> <td>9.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Every Child’s Hope</td> <td>13</td> <td>57</td> <td>22.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Giant Steps</td> <td>6</td> <td>34</td> <td>17.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Logos</td> <td>20</td> <td>108</td> <td>18.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MaryGrove</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>88.90%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Agency	SSD Students	Total Enrollment	Percentage SSD	Center of Autism	2	39	5.10%	Edgewood Children’s Home	34	226	15.00%	Epworth	7	71	9.90%	Every Child’s Hope	13	57	22.80%	Giant Steps	6	34	17.60%	Logos	20	108	18.50%	MaryGrove	8	9	88.90%
Agency	SSD Students	Total Enrollment	Percentage SSD																																
Center of Autism	2	39	5.10%																																
Edgewood Children’s Home	34	226	15.00%																																
Epworth	7	71	9.90%																																
Every Child’s Hope	13	57	22.80%																																
Giant Steps	6	34	17.60%																																
Logos	20	108	18.50%																																
MaryGrove	8	9	88.90%																																

Measurable Objective 3:	2.3 Descriptive. Percent of students attending POS agencies by disability. The total student number reported here is based on active students in January when the data were pulled from the database.						
	Autism	Emotionally Disturbed	Intellectual Disability	Other Health Impaired	Specific Learning Disability	Hearing Impaired	Total
Students	24	52	3	10	1	1	91
Percent	26.4%	57.1%	3.3%	11.0%	1.1%	1.1%	100.0%

Measurable Objective 4:	2.4 Percent of SSD students of majority and minority ethnicity in POS agencies. The total students includes all active and withdrawn students from the SIS database.														
<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="3">Percent Majority and Minority of all Active and Withdrawn Students</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Majority</td> <td>70</td> <td>66.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minority</td> <td>36</td> <td>34.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>106</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table>				Percent Majority and Minority of all Active and Withdrawn Students			Majority	70	66.0%	Minority	36	34.0%	Total	106	100%
Percent Majority and Minority of all Active and Withdrawn Students															
Majority	70	66.0%													
Minority	36	34.0%													
Total	106	100%													

Measurable Objective 5:	2.5 Percent male and female of SSD students in POS agencies from SIS active and withdrawn students. These numbers include only the students who qualified for free or reduced lunch through direct certification*.														
<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="3">Percent by Gender of all Active and Withdrawn Students</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>31</td> <td>29.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>75</td> <td>70.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>106</td> <td>100.0%</td> </tr> </table>				Percent by Gender of all Active and Withdrawn Students			Female	31	29.2%	Male	75	70.8%	Total	106	100.0%
Percent by Gender of all Active and Withdrawn Students															
Female	31	29.2%													
Male	75	70.8%													
Total	106	100.0%													

Measurable Objective 6:	2.6 Unable to provide accurate information at this time to measure this Objective. Of students in POS agencies, 23.6% receive Free/Reduced Lunch via Direct Certification.*
-------------------------	---

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

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Students are making academic progress in Reading as measured by the STAR assessment.</i> • <i>Students are making academic progress in Math as measured by the STAR assessment.</i> • <i>Therapeutic interventions are provided.</i>
--

- *There is increased collaboration between SSD and agencies.*
- Opportunities/Weaknesses
- *Proportional attendance goals were not met.*
 - *MPI scores for English Language Arts and for Mathematics decreased from 2013.*
 - *A significant number of students are being placed in a more restrictive environment through the POS program.*
 - *Students who receive free or reduced lunch through household applications are not reported to SSD.*

How well aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?

There is some misalignment between the academic goals of the program and the therapeutic goals of the agencies.

Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.

Should resources be changed to improve this program? Yes No

Should goals be changed, added or removed? Yes No

Evaluation Implications

What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare separate public schools?

<i>Total POS Annual Costs 2013-14:</i>	\$2,095,390.00
<i>Students (October DESE Reporting)</i>	73
<i>Average cost per student</i>	\$28,703.97

<i>Total Separate Public School Costs 2013-14</i>	\$31,670,044.53
<i>Students (October DESE Reporting)</i>	754
<i>Average cost per student</i>	\$42,014.65

Discussion of costs: The costs to SSD for students in POS agencies are not true total student costs since each of the POS agencies augments their budget by fundraising through private donors. Since the primary focus of the POS agencies is therapeutic and is a more restrictive environment, the separate public schools have more educational supports. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the turnover of teachers at the agencies is higher than in the separate public schools and that pay rates for SSD teachers are higher than in POS agencies. That being said, the cost to SSD of educating a student in a separate public schools is 50 percent higher than in a POS agency at least in part since SSD benefits from the fundraising efforts of the agencies for students placed in POS agencies.

Estimated Cost Effectiveness

- Mandated program; costs cannot be significantly reduced.
- Mandated program; costs could be reduced (include in Action Plan, below).
- Benefits greatly outweigh costs.

- Benefits outweigh cost, but improvement appears possible (include in Action Plan, below).
- Costs outweigh benefits (include in Action Plan, below).

General Recommendation Resulting from this 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 Plans

What specific actions are needed?

- Continue to work with agencies to improve instruction.
- Work with agencies to find ways to improve attendance.
- Establish a process for the agencies to report students who receive free or reduced lunch status through household applications.
- Examine possible scenarios for adding resources to the separate public schools so that some students may be retained in a less restrictive environment (LRE).

***Operational Definitions:**

Adoption Subsidy refers to a fund provided by the North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC).

Direct Certification refers to the process conducted by the States and by local educational agencies to certify eligible children for free meals with the need for household applications.

Full time enrollment equivalent (FTE) refers to the proportion of the students actual enrollment to the entire school year. A student who was only enrolled for seventy five percent of the year would have an FTE of 0.75.

MAP Index scores refer to an indicator of achievement for a group of students which gives relative weight to students in each category from below basic to advanced. The index ranges from 100 to 500 with a higher score meaning that more students scored in higher categories.

Proportional attendance refers to the new DESE standard for measuring attendance. It is a calculation of the total number of students whose attendance is over 90% times their full time enrollment equivalent divided by the total FTE enrollment of the school.

STAR scores refers to scores on the STAR Renaissance Assessments developed and provided through Renaissance Learning. STAR scores include scale and grade equivalent scores in Reading and Mathematics.