



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:

Student Intake Process

Program Evaluation Questions:

1. Do our existing procedures incorporate the needed information to determine whether or not students in the Intake process are eligible for services?
2. Is information obtained and routed in an efficient manner to assure minimal delay in services being provided?

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation:

Linda Shemwell, Executive Director

Mary Lee Burlemann, Area Coordinator of Student Information

Date of Evaluation:

January 2005-June 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

The goal of the Student Intake Process is to ensure the processing of student information meets legal requirements and necessary information reaches program administrators within 10 days of Special School District's receipt of a student's special education records.

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

The Intake Process ensures students are entered into the SSD system in a timely fashion and assures they are afforded the full range of educational programs required by MSIP Document F. The Intake Process is responsible for the entry of students into the SSD database. Students may be referred for initial evaluations, they may already have current special education records and are moving into the county from elsewhere, or they may be re-entering the SSD system from another school district with current special education records. Students moving within



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

the St. Louis County area are “School Changed” in the Intake Process to reflect the new demographic information and school information.

Demographic Description of Program:

Location:

Central Office, occurring on a countywide basis in all districts

Number of staff:

1 Area Coordinator, 6 secretaries

Participants:

Counselors and/or registrars in each partner district
Senders of records from any school districts within and outside the state
Parents/legal guardians

Length of program/service:

Continuous

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Linda Shemwell, SSD Executive Director
Michele Augustin, SSD Director, Related Services
Marsha Guilliams, SSD Director, North Region
Mary Lee Burlemann, Area Coordinator, Student Information
Brenda Brown, SSD Area Coordinator, North Region
Karen Gender, SSD Area Coordinator, South Region
Donette Green, Executive Director, Special Services, Pattonville S.D.
LeRoy Parr, Guidance Counselor, Riverview Gardens S.D.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered

Perception Data

Partner District surveys

Liaison return rate of 65%

Partner District Building Contact return rate of 51%



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Longitudinal performance data
Number of transfer files for the past 5 years
Turn-around time spreadsheet for 2004-05 SY
MSIP Document F

IV. Data Collection Methodology

Questionnaire
Document Review
File Reviews

V. Results

Time spent on program evaluation: 143 Hours

Strengths of program/service:

- Number of cases processed each year
 - Intakes – 5048 average per year for past five years
 - Transfers – 2927 average per year for past five years
- Average of eight days from receipt of records to approval for services during the 2004-05 SY
- 81% of survey respondents indicated procedures are adequate for students to obtain their special education services as quickly as possible
- File reviews indicated 100% compliance for the following Doc. F MSIP standards: 100000; 100100; 100200; 100900; 101100; 101300; 101400; 101500; 101700; 101900; 102000

Concerns regarding program/service:

- An average of 36 days expired between the time partner districts enrolled students and their provision to SSD of a notice of transfer (Turn-around time data)
- Due to the delay of notification to SSD, an average of 44 days expired between enrollment of students in partner districts and approval for services by SSD (Turn-around time data)
- File reviews indicated the following Doc. F MSIP standards are below an 80% compliance rate: 100400; 100500; 100600; 101800; 102100; 102200
- Two methods for approval of transfer students exist: (1) all documents are collected and approved within the component district building and then information is sent to



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

SSD (2) SSD is notified to collect documentation and the approval process is conducted by the Area Coordinator of Student Information (Survey data)

- Diversity/inconsistency of partner district methods for identifying special education needs on their district's enrollment forms (Survey data)

Recommendations regarding program/service:

- Use of DESE's recommended form for Intake Processing to assure appropriate documentation of all MSIP standards
- Additional training of Partner District Building Contacts regarding completion and submission of transfer notices
- Provide all partner districts with standard language regarding identifying special education status on their enrollment forms
- Determine if one system for approval of transfer students needs to be implemented in order to achieve consistency for the process

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

Action Plan attached

Person responsible to champion Action Plan: Linda Shemwell

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation