



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:

Special education for children with deafblindness

Evaluation Questions:

- (a) Evaluate the level of satisfaction with services for the population of students with deafblindness provided by Special School District.
- (b) Determine if the appropriate level and type of technology is being utilized for each student with deafblindness giving them effective access to the school program?

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation:

Lisa Mouldon Gilbertsen, MS, ABA Area Coordinator

Date of Evaluation:

January-June 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

To provide to students with individualized vision and hearing services by:

Providing a wide variety of individualized educational programming and support services for children and adolescents with both visual and hearing impairments designed to ensure each student's successful contribution to our community.

Developing effective relationships with parents, teachers/staff and students.

Ensuring staff maintains knowledge of current practices, procedures and assistive technology in the fields of vision and hearing so that each student may benefit from appropriate and current educational technology and adaptive devices.



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 evaluation of CSIP goals provides information that is beneficial to adjust the curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of the students. (MSIP standards 6.2 and 6.3). A variety of instructional equipment and adaptive devices, such as Braille books, augmentative communication devices, and vision and hearing technology are integral to the program goal and support the MSIP goal 6.4.

Demographic Description of Program:

Location: Countywide—students receiving both consultative and/or direct services for both vision and hearing impairments are served in several school districts across the county in a variety of settings. 25% of students are receiving services in general education programs within their local school districts, and 75% of students are receiving services in public separate schools, including Special School District School Buildings and Missouri School for the Blind.

Students: Special School District currently provides both direct hearing and vision services to three students in the district and a combination of either direct or consultative vision and hearing services to an additional five students in the district. Due to the small number of students receiving services in the district, additional demographic information is not being reported in order to preserve student confidentiality.

Participants: Parents, staff, teachers, and students of all St. Louis County, ages birth – 21, who are eligible for direct and/or indirect vision and hearing services.

Length of program/service:

The evaluation committee met first in January 2005. The evaluations of the Deafblind Program began with phone surveys (conducted in March 2005) to parents and staff of students receiving direct services in both vision and hearing. Due to the small number of students receiving these services, additional phone surveys were conducted with parents and staff of students receiving either direct or consultative services in vision and hearing in April of 2005.

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

SSD staff: Lisa Mouldon Gilbertsen, Area Coordinator (ABA)



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Betty Davidson, Area Coordinator (Vision Impaired)
Sandy Anzalone, Area Coordinator (Hearing Impaired)
Beth Mrozowicz, Area Coordinator (ABA)
Chris Montgomery, Director (Central Region and Low Incidence)
Ellen Nicholl, Teacher (Vision Itinerant)
Shelly Smith, MIS

Community: Larry Rhodes (Missouri School for the Blind)

Parent: Rose Psara (Mehlville School District)

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered:

- Special Education referral/evaluation information review
- IEP review
- Perception Data: Parent Survey, Staff Survey

IV. Data Collection Methodology:

Staff survey
Parent/Caregiver survey
IEP Analysis
Diagnostic Report Analysis

Data was collected on the level of satisfaction with vision and hearing services provided by SSD. This included the satisfaction of assistive technology and adaptive devices and services utilized for each student with deafblindness.

1. The caregiver satisfaction survey of the Deafblind program included 17 questions scored on a likert scale, including 4 questions on assistive technology and adaptive devices, and 1 open question for comments. The response rate for surveys was 100% for students receiving direct services in both vision and hearing and 40% for students receiving consultative services in vision and hearing.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

2. The staff satisfaction survey of the Deafblind program included 18 questions scored on a likert scale, including 5 questions on assistive technology, and 1 open question for comments. The response rate for staff surveys was 29%.
3. Information provided from the 2004 Missouri Deafblind Census indicated that 17 students within the St. Louis County area were counted on the census as having deafblindness and being eligible for federal and state assistance. A file review of these students, including review of diagnostic reports and IEPs indicated that 8 of these 17 students (47%) were receiving both direct and/or consultative services for vision and hearing through Special School District.
4. Examination of diagnostic reports indicated that 6 out of these 17 students (35%) received educational diagnosis of either deafblind or multiple disabilities consisting of concomitant impairments that included vision and hearing impairments. 38% of students receiving both direct and/or consultative services in vision and hearing were also given this diagnosis.

V. Results

Time spent on program evaluation: 71.75 hours

Committee meetings	=	25.25 aggregate staff hours
File reviews	=	15.5 aggregate staff hours
Secretarial collation	=	01 hours
Chairperson collation	=	25 hours
Report writing	=	05 hours
Total hours	=	71.75 hours

Strengths of program/service:

Caregiver

1. Caregiver/parent satisfaction surveys of the deafblind program were conducted by phone in March and April of 2005 with an overall response rate of 70% for students receiving some type (consultative or direct) of both hearing and vision services (100% of caregivers of students receiving both direct hearing and vision services responded, while 40% of the caregivers of students receiving consultative services responded). The results reveal an overall moderately high rate of satisfaction with the services for students with deafblindness 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 3.68. The overall mean for students



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

receiving a combination of direct and consultative services for both vision and hearing revealed a high rate of satisfaction with a mean satisfaction rating of 4.38 on a five point rating scale. Seven questions had moderately high to high strength. These questions evaluated the consideration of the child's disabilities to ensure safety in the school setting, the amount of time teachers responded quickly to parent questions and concerns, the provision of appropriate adaptive devices for both the vision and hearing impairments, the contact with the area coordinator, the provision of timely IEP progress reports on a schedule equal to that of the grade reports, and the provision of appropriate support from teacher's assistants/aides. Items of strength received overall scores ranging from 4.0 to 4.25.

Caregivers rated four questions on adaptive devices/assistive technology. They rated the item on the child has the appropriate adaptive device and support to help compensate for the student's hearing impairment with a score of 4.0. They also rated the item on the child has the appropriate adaptive device and support to help compensate for the student's vision impairment with a score of 4.0.

The overall mean for caregiver satisfaction for students receiving a combination of direct and consultative services in both vision and hearing was 4.38. Several additional items were noted as items of strength in this group of surveys. 10 out of the 17 survey questions received a mean score of 4.5 or above. Four questions were areas of great strength receiving a mean score of 5.0. These questions evaluated the consideration of the child's disabilities to ensure safety in the school setting, the amount of time teachers responded quickly to parent questions and concerns, the provision of appropriate adaptive devices and support to compensate for the student's visual impairment, and the assistance provided to students by teachers in transitions between schools and/or grades.

The strength comments on the parent/guardian satisfaction surveys: Parents stated that they had very good experiences with both the vision and hearing teachers and the interpreters were extremely helpful.

Staff

2. Staff satisfaction surveys of the vision and hearing teachers and the deafblind program were conducted by phone during March of 2005 with a return rate of 29%. The results reveal an overall high rate of satisfaction with the vision and hearing services provided for students with deafblindness by Special School District. On a five (5-high) point rating scale, the average of all of the district staff responses resulted in a total of 4.8. The overall ratings for questions on the survey ranged from 4.2 to 5.0. 11 out of the 18 survey questions received a mean rating of 5.0. These items evaluated the consideration of the child's



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

disabilities to ensure safety in the school setting, the amount of service time for the vision and hearing impairments, and the assistance from the vision and hearing itinerant teachers in preparing the student and staff for transitions between grades and/or schools.

Staff rated five questions on adaptive devices/assistive technology. Three of these questions were given an overall high score of 5.0. These included questions evaluating the provision of adaptive aides/materials when needed by both the vision and hearing teachers and the provision of appropriate adaptive devices and support for their use by the hearing itinerant teachers. Questions evaluating the appropriate nature of goals, adaptations and modifications for the student's vision and hearing impairments made by both the vision and hearing teachers were given overall scores of 4.8. In addition, an overall score of 4.7 was noted for the question evaluating the provision of appropriate adaptive devices and support by vision itinerant teachers.

The strength comments on the staff satisfaction surveys stated that staff enjoy working with the hearing itinerant teachers, there is strong continuity between staff for students, and staff are generally happy with the deafblind program.

The results reveal an overall high rate of staff satisfaction and a moderate to moderately high rate of caregiver satisfaction with the services for students with deafblindness provided by Special School District.

Concerns regarding program/service:

Overall

- a) There is a discrepancy between the number of students within Special School District who qualify for the Missouri Deafblind Census and the number of students receiving direct and/or consultative services in both vision and hearing through Special School District. Only 47% of students within Special School District who are on the census are receiving these services through Special School District.

Caregiver

- b) There is a discrepancy between caregiver satisfaction ratings for students receiving direct services in both vision and hearing (overall satisfaction



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

rating of 2.97) and students receiving a combination of both consultative and direct services in vision and hearing (overall satisfaction rating of 4.38).

Scores of relative concern (a score of below 3.0 on a 5.0 likert scale) were noted for five of the 17 questions on the caregiver satisfaction survey given to caregivers of students receiving both direct vision and hearing services. These areas of relative concern included questions evaluating the appropriateness of IEP goals, adaptations, and modifications, the knowledge of SSD teachers concerning community resources for students with deafblindness and their families, the appropriateness of adaptive devices that allow students to communicate with others, the assistance of SSD teachers to support students during transitions between grades and/or schools, and the amount of input provided by teachers to parents.

Caregiver concern comments included statements that parents feel they have little contact with the hearing and vision teachers, there is a need for more cohesion between the vision and hearing programs, little information is given to parents concerning their child's progress, and that there is no experts or teachers certified in teaching deafblind students within the district.

Recommendations regarding program/service:

- a) It is recommended that the Special School District criteria for an educational diagnosis of Deafblindness be evaluate to ensure that we are identifying all students in need of services.
- b) Evaluate the criteria for vision and hearing direct and consultative services to ensure services are being provided to all students with deafblindness in need of these services.
- c) Develop a system for teachers to communicate progress, updates, and potential need for updates of adaptive devices to parents via a note, phone call, student report card, or staffing on a quarterly basis.
- d) Ensure that Augmentative Communication SETT Process is conducted for all students identified with deafblindness, and provide training to the Augmentative Communication staff to assist them in evaluating students



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

with deafblindness in order to ensure all students in need of augmentative communication are utilizing adaptive technology that is appropriate.

- e) Evaluate the need for an expert in deafblindness in the district and determine if such an individual is needed to coordinate services or manage the cases of all students with deafblindness within Special School District.



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

Lisa Gilbertsen, ABA Area Coordinator

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education

Share results of this program evaluation with the Area Coordinators of the Departments for the Vision and Hearing Impaired by 7/05.

Share results of this program evaluation with SSD diagnostic staff by 9/05.

Share results with staff working in the deafblind program by August of 2005. The review of the action plan will be on going and on 12/15/05 and 6/30/06.

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation