



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Program Evaluation Question(s):

1. What is the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the Audiology services provided by Special School District?
2. Is technology providing students with a greater level of auditory access to information within school environments.

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:

Audiology Department

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation (list):

Christine Montgomery, Director of Special Education

Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):

September 2004 – January 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

To provide optimal audiological services by:

- Developing effective relationships with parents, teachers, and students
- By providing facilities that are comfortable and technologically current
- By insuring staff maintains knowledge of current practices, procedures and technology in the field of Audiology



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:

The CSIP plan for the Audiology Department is to generate and implement a system to evaluate the effectiveness of Audiology services as well as creating a comprehensive staff development plan for the Audiologists. Both of these initiatives support the stated program goal. (MSIP standards 8.1 and 8.2)

Demographic Description of Program:

Evaluations -

Location(s):

Litzsinger School
10094 Litzsinger Road
Ladue, MO 63124

SSD Central Administrative Offices
12110 Clayton Road
Town & Country, MO 63131

Instructional Support Services –

Location(s):

All St. Louis County Public Schools

Number of staff:

5.5	Audiologists
0.5	Audiology Assistant
1.0	Cochlear Implant Audiologist
1.0	Lead Screener
29.0	Part-Time Screeners
1.0	Secretary

Participants:

All St. Louis County resident students ages birth-21 are eligible for audiological screenings and evaluations. IDEA qualified students with hearing impairments and central auditory processing deficits are eligible for audiology related services as designated in an IEP.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Length of program/service:

Audiology Evaluations:

1 – 3 hours – during the regular school year calendar and during the summer months as needed.

Audiology Instructional Support Services:

Time allocation is prescribed in IEPs and services are implemented during regular school calendar and ESY programs.

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

Audiology staff:

Carol Bartell, Audiologist
Sue Marshall, Audiologist
Debra Quick, Audiologist
Jan Wheeler, Audiologist
Natalie Thiele, Audiologist
Margaret Pikora, Audiologist
Tina Wood, Audiologist
Vicki Briggs, Screening Coordinator

Administrators:

Michele Augustin, Director of Related Services
Sandy Anzalone, Asst. Area Coordinator – Deaf/HOH

Parents:

Rose Psara
Colleen Hruska

Chair:

Christine Montgomery



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

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

- Staff perception
- Parent perception
- Audiology self-study
- Classroom Performance data

IV. Data Collection Methodology (examples)

Parent/guardian satisfaction survey
Teacher satisfaction survey
Standardized Inventory – Listening Inventory For Education (L.I.F.E.)
Self-Study focus group

V. Results

Time spent on program evaluation: 93 hours

Strengths of program/service:

- 102 “Parent Satisfaction Surveys” were distributed during October through December 2004. With a 100% rate of completion, the results reveal an overall high rate of satisfaction with the audiology services provided by Special School District on a five (5-high) point rating scale, the average of all of the parent responses resulted in a total of 4.5. The most favorably rated item had an average score of 4.75 evaluating, the quality of contact between the parent and the audiologist. The lowest average response of an item was 3.95. This item quantified the audiologist’s level of involvement in the child’s IEP.
- The surveys completed by the Itinerant and Classroom teachers in the Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing program report a level of satisfaction commensurate with the parent results. The 4.6 overall average for the teacher satisfaction surveys reveal a strong approval rating for the audiology services provided to the students receiving special education services through the District’s Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing Program.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- The satisfaction survey results are consistent with the outcomes of previous program evaluations (2003/2004, 2003/2002).
- Survey items relating specifically to quality of staff performance receive the highest ratings from both parents and staff.
- The results of the L.I.F.E. standardized questionnaire show that the technology recommended, and supplied through the audiology department, has had a positive impact on student performance in classroom settings. The average of the total score of the teacher rating scales is 29. A score of 35 is interpreted as “strong support for positive change: Use (of technology) is highly beneficial.” A score of 17 reflects “support for positive change: Use (of technology) is beneficial.” The overall rating of 29 demonstrates that students’ classroom experiences have been improved as a result of technology provided by the Audiology Department.
- The items on the L.I.F.E. protocol can be associated with factors that support student learning. The results show that students significantly improved in the areas of attention/focus, sound discrimination, comprehension, and class participation as a result of the technology supplied to improve audition.

Concerns regarding program/service:

- Without ongoing review and revision of procedures/routines, the high level of stakeholder satisfaction reported may not be sustained.
- Survey comments and self-study information reflect the need to improve the Audiology facilities at the Litzinger site.
- The relatively low ratings recorded for the Audiologist’s “involvement” in IEPs (3.90) and evaluations (4.30) suggest a lack of clarity in the wording of the survey item. Because Audiologists are not needed at all IEPs and evaluations, a low rating could be just reflecting the fact that an audiologist did not participate in these activities. The item on the survey should be phrased to assess the level and the quality of the audiologist’s involvement in IEPs/Evaluations when a need for audiologist participation is indicated. With revision of the item the appropriate data can be collected and analyzed.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- The self-study information supports two (2) staff development issues. First, planning needs to occur to insure that the department goal and CSIP objectives to maintain highly qualified staff are met. Second, the Audiologists need to provide training to other special education staff on changes and advances in the field of Audiology.

Recommendations regarding program/service

- Review and revise service routines and procedures to maintain higher level of satisfaction, i.e., reminders for follow up or re-test appointments.
- Revise survey questions to obtain clear data on audiologist participation in IEP/Evaluation conferences.
- Improve facility/waiting room accommodations at the Litzinger site.
- Provide in-service/training on basic Audiology services and advances in the field of Audiology to deaf/hard-of-hearing teaching staff.
- Insure Audiology staff maintains “state-of-the-art” level of skills and proficiencies.

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

Person responsible to champion action plan: Christine Montgomery

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education

Progress Report on action plans (attached): 6/30/05
12/15/05

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation