



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services: Purchase of Service

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation: Anne Wynn, Purchase of Service Area Coordinator

Date of Evaluation: Fall 2004

Objective of Program Evaluation:

To investigate if students with purchase of service IEP's are returning to a less restrictive environment, and at what percentage over a year's time. Purchase of Service enrollment data was compiled and analyzed from 1998 to 2004. The team also investigated restraint data from 2003-2004 and fall semester 2004-2005.

Brief description of relationship between program goals:

CSIP and MSIP Standards: Information gathered would help evaluate SSD's provision of comprehensive services for resident children with disabilities and ensure provision of special education services in accordance with state and federal regulations. (IDEA and Chapter 162 RsMO, SSD DistrictWide CSIP Plan Objective No. 2A and MSIP Standard 7.1)

Demographic Description of Program

Program description: SSD contracts with nine (9) agencies to provide services to students whose special needs cannot be met in the public school setting. Location is included in description of program.

Staffing: SSD employs a .5 speech and language pathologist, an area coordinator, and diagnostic services.

The agencies provide all teaching and therapeutic personnel.

Length of Service: The IEP team determines a child's length of stay at the agency.

Child Center of Our Lady (Normandy)

- Special education services and individual and group therapy are provided for emotional/learning disabled youth, ages 5 to 14
- Three classrooms serving 36 children



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

- One-to-four staff-to-child ratio
- Creative arts therapies
- Recreational therapy

Edgewood Children's Center (Webster)

- 15 classrooms each offer 8-10 children individualized special education, coupled with in-house treatment and family involvement for students with autism, emotional disorders, other health impairments, speech/language, and learning disabilities
- Art, music, speech, occupational therapy, and life skills
- Ages 5-21, except for autism which is 5-14

Epworth School (Webster)

- Special education services for adolescents, ages 7 to 21, who have been diagnosed with severe learning disabilities, emotional disorders, autism, mental retardation, and other health impairments through the IEP process
- Integrates individual and group therapy services with academic studies, vocational training, small classes, and life skills development
- Averages 8 students per classroom
- Social skills and anger management are taught
- Special electives include art, drawing, outdoor education, cooking, dance and creative writing

Evangelical Children's Home (Normandy)

- Special education services for students from 7-21 with emotional disorders, mental retardation, other health impairments, speech/language, and learning disabilities
- Group and individual therapy

Giant Steps of St. Louis (Parkway)

- Educational program for children with Autism Spectrum Disorder from ages 5-14
- Therapies provided are music, speech and language, academics, play and social communication, academics paired with movement and occupational therapy



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Logos School (Ladue)

- Academic program for adolescents in grades 7-12 who have failed academically in traditional settings
- 6:1 student to teacher ratio in the classroom
- Combines strong academics with individual and group therapy and parental support to help students succeed

Marygrove (Hazelwood)

- Special education for students with autism, emotional disorders, other health impairments, speech/language, and learning disabilities for ages 6-21
- Academic goals along with a strong emphasis on individual behavior goals
- Majority of students attend off-campus classes in Hazelwood and/or SSD buildings

Metropolitan School (Maplewood)

- Educational program for middle and senior high school students who have learning disabilities, emotional disorders and other health impairments
- Classes limited to 9 students
- Metropolitan does not provide therapy

St. Vincent Home for Children (Normandy)

- Academic program for students from 6-16 who have emotional disorders, mental retardation, learning disabilities and other health impairments
- Individual, group and family therapy as well as art therapy and behavior modification

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

Parent engagement activities: 114 parent satisfaction surveys were mailed and 28 surveys were returned. This was a return rate of 24%. The parent survey data was disaggregated by agency unless there was not a parent reply from a particular agency. There is also an overall summary of parent satisfaction for all of the parents with children being served in the POS agencies. (See attached Document D1-D5)

Community member involvement: Mr. Pablo Flinn, Asst. Program director at Epworth School, participated on the committee.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

SSD staff involvement: SSD area coordinators Ms. Anne Wynn, Ms. Mary Hendricks-Harris, Ms. JoAnn Levering, Mr. Bob Molitor, and Ms. Angie O'Brien, were all committee participants.

Student Involvement: Seven students were contacted and participated in a phone survey. The students surveyed had graduated or dropped out during the 2003-2004 school year.

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

- X Staff perception
- Assessment statistics
- Financial data
- Attendance rate
- X Dropout rate
- Suspension rate
- Expulsion rates
- Participation rate in co-curricular/extracurricular
- X College/vocational attrition rates
- Student attitude and interest survey
- Longitudinal performance data
- Achievement data
- X Perception data
- X IEPs
- X Movement to LRE
- X Other (list): Graduation rate, movement to a more restrictive setting, restraint data and post program follow-up data

IV. Data Collection Methodology

- Parent/guardian survey
- Student phone survey
- Demographic data
- IEP data and document review
- Restraint Data
- Post-program follow-up data

V. Results



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Time Spent on Program Evaluation

Committee Team Meetings

September 22, 2004

November 25, 2004

December 6, 2004

January 26, 2005

Total number of hours spent on program evaluation: **31**

Results of data collection

Restraint Data: Restraint data from 2003-2004 and fall semester 2004 is attached. All of the POS agencies use Safe Crises Management restraint procedures with the exception of Giant Steps. Giant Steps has been trained in NCPI. Restraint data should be submitted to the area coordinator within one week of the incident; however, the restraint forms are not consistently submitted in a timely manner. The restraint data indicates that some agencies use restraint more frequently and for longer periods of time. The agencies that service 20 or more students and served mostly high school age students had the most instances of restraint. (See attached Document A)

Movement to a lesser restrictive environment: This data is a collection of June 2003-2004 year-end data. Movement from POS to the regular education setting and from POS to a separate public school setting is both viewed as movement to a lesser restrictive setting. The data is listed as an overall percentage of movement to LRE and also if the movement was to the regular education setting or to a separate public school setting. Data is reported per agency. The results of this data indicate that there are some agencies returning students to a lesser restrictive environment at a higher percentage than other agencies. (See attached Document B1 and B2)

POS Enrollment: This data is recorded on a Fact Sheet and is a collection of June 2003-2004 year-end data. This data also reports the average number of students serviced in the agencies during the 2003-2004 school year. The statistics span the years 1998-2004 charting the numbers of POS students including percentage of increase and decrease in enrollment over the years. The data also shows movement from POS to other educational settings.

The results of this data indicate that enrollment steadily increased from 1998-2002, but declined during the 2003-2004 school year. The data also shows that the majority of the students being served in the POS agencies are in the custody of the Division of Family Services, Division of Mental Health, or Division of Youth Services. The students in the legal custody of DFS, DMS, or DYS are usually in residential placement, but some



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

children live with foster families. If the child lives in the county and his parents' parental rights have been terminated, SSD can bill back most of the tuition to DESE as excessive cost. If the child is living in the county and has parents or guardians living outside the county, SSD can bill DESE for the tuition with the exception of the local tax effort. To collect the balance of the local tax effort monies, SSD bills the child's city of residence. For the 2003-2004 school year, SSD billed the local tax effort \$422,483.74 and the district's excess cost reimbursement from DESE was \$4,190,928.29. (See attached Document C1 and C2)

Post-Program Follow-up: 100% of the students surveyed stated they were attending post-secondary programs. All post-secondary programs were identified as local community colleges. 20% of the participants were employed, another 40% expressed that they were actively looking for employment, and 40% expressed they were not interested in being employed. However, one participant who was not employed reported that he volunteers at a nursing home.

One participant that had dropped out of school was also surveyed. He reported that he dropped out in 2004. This student is currently enrolled in a GED program and expects to take the GED exam in one month.

In another survey taken of students, the child's teacher completed the survey after the student transitioned to a lesser restrictive placement. Of the students who have left purchase of service and returned to a less restrictive environment, 87% have had a successful transition, while 13% have had difficulty with the transition. The data was used to determine if the therapeutic services accessed in the POS agencies aided in the child's transition to a lesser restrictive environment.

Statistics for POS Students Attending On-Grounds School: This data reports the number of students residing in each agency. The data reports how many students attend school at the on-grounds school and how many students attend school off-grounds. This data is indicative of many factors; however, the agency's relationship with the school district in which it is housed appears to be the most critical factor in determining if and how many resident students attend public school. (See attached Documents E1-E3)

Strengths of program(s):

Data from the parent survey indicates:

- Collaboration with Special School District had an average score of 4.5 with a rating of 5 being "strongly agree"

- Therapeutic services had an average score of 4.5

- Parents had an overall satisfaction rate of 4.6



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Data from the post-program follow-up surveys indicate:

- All of the 2003-2004 POS graduates are attending post-secondary programs, 6 of which are Logos graduates.
- Transitions from POS to a less restrictive environment have an 87% success rate

Data from the movement to a lesser restrictive environment indicates:

-Marygrove returns the most students to LRE with a return rate of 57% in a year's time, with Child Center returning 40%.

Data from the statistics for students attending their neighborhood school indicates:

- Marygrove has the most students attending school off-grounds with 91% of the resident students attending Hazelwood schools and SSD buildings.
- Epworth has 76% of their resident students attending Webster schools and SSD buildings.

Restraint data indicates:

- From the 2003-2004 data, Logos and Metropolitan had no reported restraints.
- From the 2003-2004 data, of those agencies reporting restraints, Edgewood reported the least amount per pupil.

Concerns regarding program include:

The two lowest scores on the parent survey were academics (score of 4.0) and climate (score of 4.2) Academics are not the primary focus for the POS agencies, and the climate is sometimes perceived as being undesirable. (See attached Document D-7)

There are significant discrepancies among the agencies, some are returning students to LRE at a rate that is remarkable, and some are not returning students full time to LRE. (See attached Doc B-1)

Some agencies work closely with the local districts to ensure that students have access to general education with non-disabled peers. (See attached Doc E-1)

Recommendations Regarding Programs:

- Share all collected information with agency directors
- Begin having discussions with the agency directors about how to streamline the criteria for returning a student to a lesser restrictive environment
- Discuss with the residential agencies their relationship with the partner districts



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

-
- Develop some possible solutions for achieving continuity across the county regarding partner district involvement with residential facilities.
 - Create an end of the year document to share with the agency directors profiling statistics of movement to LRE, percentage of graduates/drop outs, etc.

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

Person responsible to champion action plans: Anne Wynn, Area Coordinator
POS

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education: See attached Action Plans

_____ Date: _____

Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation

Adapted from Desired Results Program Action Plan
 (California Department of Education Child Development Division, 2003)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/documents/actionplan.doc>

Evaluator (Program Evaluation Chair): Anne Wynn

Program/Service: Purchase of Service

Action Plan Date: January 26, 2005

Program Findings	<p>1. BASED UPON L.R.E. DATA, CONTRACTUAL AGENCIES ARE NOT RETURNING STUDENTS TO A LESSER RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT AT COMPARABLE RATES.</p>
------------------	---

Action Plan Goal	Action Plan Objectives	Expected Completion Date and Persons Responsible	Follow-Up
<p>1. Educate the agency directors about the statistics across the county regarding movement towards L.R.E.</p> <p>2. Increase the number of students returning to a lesser restrictive environment.</p>	<p>1. Discuss data with agency directors.</p> <p>2. Analyze data with agency directors and problem solve solutions.</p> <p>4. Implement solutions</p> <p>3. Create a year-end document to share with agency directors highlighting movement to L.R.E.</p>	<p>July 2005 Area Coordinator</p> <p>August 2005 Area Coordinator</p> <p>December 2005 Area Coordinator Agency Directors</p> <p>June 2006 Area Coordinator</p>	<p>Monthly L.R.E. data per agency will reflect increased movement to LRE</p>

Adapted from Desired Results Program Action Plan
 (California Department of Education Child Development Division, 2003)
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/documents/actionplan.doc>


Evaluator (Program Evaluation Chair): Anne Wynn _____
 Program/Service: Purchase of Service _____
 Action Plan Date: January 26, 2005 _____


Program Findings	<p>1. AS A RESULT OF THE PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY, SCHOOL CLIMATE WAS ONE OF THE LOWEST SCORED AREAS WITH A SCORE OF 4.2.</p>
------------------	--

Action Plan Goal	Action Plan Objectives	Expected Completion Date and Persons Responsible	Follow-Up
<p>1. Educate the agency directors about the results of the parent survey.</p> <p>2. Increase the number of parents who have a positive perception of the school climate.</p>	<p>1. Discuss data with agency directors.</p> <p>2. Analyze data with agency directors and problem solve solutions.</p> <p>3. Implement solutions.</p> <p>4. Send out another parent survey to reassess school climate perceptions.</p>	<p>July, 2005 Area Coordinator</p> <p>August, 2005 Area Coordinator</p> <p>December 2005 Area Coordinator Agency Director</p> <p>June 2006 Area Coordinator</p>	<p>Scores on the '06 survey will be a 4.4 or better.</p>

Data reflects information taken from restraint documentation forms collected from 2003-2004 and fall semester 2004-2005. Numbers represented for 2003-2004 are for a full school year including extended school year.

*Numbers for the 2004-2005 school year are for one semester only from August '04 to December '04





Epworth and Evangelical accept students who are extremely aggressive. They also have the greatest number of P.O.S. high school students.

PURCHASE OF SERVICE**DATA REVIEW FOR MOVEMENT TO A LESSER RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT 2003-2004****EPWORTH**

YEARLY		YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES	
AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	50	OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	24%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	7	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	14%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	5	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	10%

EDGEWOOD

YEARLY		YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES	
AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	40	OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	14%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	1	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	2%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	5	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	12%

LOGOS

YEARLY		YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES	
AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	30	OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	0.5%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	2	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0.5%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	0	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	0%

ST. VINCENT'S

YEARLY		YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES	
AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	8	OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	25%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0%
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	2	% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	25%

METROPOLITAN**YEARLY**

AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	3
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	0

YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	0%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	0%

MARYGROVE**YEARLY**

AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	7
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	3
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	1

YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	57%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	42%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	14%

CHILD CENTER**YEARLY**

AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	10
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	1
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	3

YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	40%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	10%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	30%

EVANGELICAL**YEARLY**

AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	22
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	4
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	3

YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	32%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	18%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	14%

GIANT STEPS**YEARLY**

AVERAGE # OF STUDENTS	17
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0
# OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	0

YEARLY OVERALL PERCENTAGES

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RETURN TO LRE	0%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO REG. ED	0%
% OF STUDENTS RETURNED TO LRE/PUBLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL	0%

Purchase Of Service Fact Sheet, 2003-04

POS Enrollment

school yr.	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
# of students	52	102	145	146	206	186
Difference	NA	50	43	1	60	-20
Increase	NA	96%	42%	.01%	41%	(-10%)

New Students Placed in Purchase of Service Agencies October 2, 2003 – June 15, 2004

	Number of New Students	Percentage of Students
TOTAL	62	
Placed in POS placement from partner school district. Living with parents.	18	29%
Student in custody of DFS	41	66%
Students in custody of DYS	3	5%

Students Who Exited Purchase of Service Agencies October 2, 2003 – June 15, 2004

	Number of Students	Percent of new students those that exited
TOTAL	90	
Moved out of St. Louis County	45	50%
Moved to LRE (home school or SSD building)	25	29%
Dropped out or earning GED	4	4%
Moved to more restrictive setting (homebound/hospital)	4	4%
Moved to Juvenile Detention Center	4	4%
Graduated	8	9%

Local Tax Effort/Excess Cost
2003-2004 School Year

		<u>% LTE to Excess Cost</u>
Local Tax Effort-Billed	422,483.74	10.80%
Local Tax Effort-Not Billed	267,227.80	6.38%
Total LTE	689,711.54	16.46%
Excess Cost Reimbursement	4,190,928.29	

METROPOLITAN PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-1

Dec-04

N= 3 Sent out 3 surveys, 3 surveys were returned (100% return rate).	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	2	1	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	0	0

GIANT STEPS PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-2

Dec-04

N= 1 Sent out 13 surveys, 1 surveys were returned (.07% return rate).	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:									
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4.0	1	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	3.0	1	0	0

LOGOS PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-3

Dec-04

N= 11 Sent out 32 surveys, 11 surveys were returned (34% return rate).	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	0%	9%	18%	73%	4.6	11	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	18%	0%	9%	73%	4.4	11	0	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	9%	0%	18%	27%	45%	4.0	11	0	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	0%	9%	27%	18%	45%	4.0	11	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	9%	18%	73%	4.6	11	0	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:	0%	0%	45%	9%	45%	4.0	11	0	0
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	0%	0%	27%	36%	36%	4.1	11	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	0%	0%	9%	36%	55%	4.5	11	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	4.3	11	0	0

EVANGELICAL PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-4

Dec-04

N= 2 Sent out 8 surveys, 2 surveys were returned (25% return rate).	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4.5	2	0	0

EPWORTH PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-5

Dec-04

N= 6 Sent out 11 surveys, 6 surveys were returned (40% return rate).	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	17%	0%	33%	50%	4.2	6	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	20%	0%	20%	60%	4.2	5	1	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	17%	0%	0%	17%	67%	4.2	6	0	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	17%	0%	50%	0%	33%	3.3	6	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	4.0	6	0	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	3.7	6	0	0
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	17%	0%	33%	0%	50%	3.7	6	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	17%	0%	17%	17%	50%	3.8	6	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	17%	0%	33%	0%	50%	3.7	6	0	0

EDGEWOOD PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-6

Dec-04

N= 4 Sent out 11 surveys, 4 surveys were returned (36% return rate).	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	4	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4.8	4	0	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	3	1	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4.3	4	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	4	0	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	4	0	0
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	4	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	4	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5.0	4	0	0

POS PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

DOC D-7

Dec-04

N= 27	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderate	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Valid N	Do not know/Not Applicable	Missing (Blank)
Sent out 114surveys, 27 surveys were returned (23.8% return rate).	1	2	3	4	5				
1. Rate your satisfaction on your child's current school placement?	0%	4%	4%	22%	70%	4.6	27	0	0
2. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ SSD:	0%	12%	0%	19%	69%	4.5	26	1	0
3. Rate your child's team on the following: Parent Support:	8%	0%	8%	23%	62%	4.3	26	1	0
4. Rate your child's team on the following: Academic:	4%	4%	26%	19%	48%	4.0	27	0	0
5. Rate your child's team on the following: Therapy:	0%	0%	12%	23%	65%	4.5	26	1	0
6. Rate your child's team on the following: Climate:	0%	4%	26%	15%	56%	4.2	27	0	0
7. Rate your child's team on the following: Facility:	4%	0%	19%	22%	56%	4.3	27	0	0
8. Rate your child's team on the following: Collaboration w/ Family:	4%	0%	7%	26%	63%	4.4	27	0	0
9. Rate your child's team on the following: Responsiveness of staff:	4%	4%	15%	15%	63%	4.3	27	0	0

Statistics for POS Students Attending Off-Grounds School Demographic by Agency December 1, 2004

*The term “resident students” refers to students residing at the agency.

Epworth- South Region Webster Groves School District

Total # of Students in Residence	<u>50</u>
Total # of Resident Students attending on-campus school	12
Total # of Resident students with POS IEP at on-campus school	9
Total # of Resident Students in Webster schools without IEP	19
Total # of Resident Students with IEP’s going to Webster schools	14
Total # of Resident Students with IEP’s going to SSD schools	5
<hr/>	
✓ % of students who attend school off grounds	76%
✓ % of students who attend off grounds with IEP’s	38%
✓ % of students attending school on-grounds as county POS student	18%

Edgewood- South Region Webster Groves School District

Total # of Students in Residence	<u>33</u>
Total # of Resident Students attending on-campus school	32
Total # of Resident Students with POS IEP at on-campus school	31
Total # of Resident Students in Webster schools without IEP’s	0
Total # of Resident Students with IEP’s going to Webster schools	0
Total # of Resident Students with IEP’s going to SSD schools	1
<hr/>	
✓ % of students who attend school off grounds	.03%
✓ % of students who attend off grounds with IEP’s	.03%
✓ % of students attending school on-grounds as county POS student	96%

Marygrove- North Region
Hazelwood School District

Total # of Students in Residence	<u>90</u>
Total # of Resident Students attending on-campus school	8
Total # of Resident Students with POS IEP at on-campus school	8
Total # of Resident Students in Hazelwood schools without IEP	26
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to Hazel. schools	44
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to SSD schools	12
<hr/>	
✓ % of students who attend school off grounds	91%
✓ % of students who attend school off grounds with IEP's	62%
✓ % of students attending school on-grounds as county POS student	.08%

Evangelical- Central Region
Normandy School District

Total # of Students in Residence	<u>47</u>
Total # of Resident Students attending on-campus school	33
Total # of Resident Students with POS IEP at on-campus school	21
Total # of Resident Students in Normandy schools without IEP	5
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to Norman. schools	3
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to SSD schools	6
<hr/>	
✓ % of students who attend school off-grounds	30%
✓ % of students who attend school off grounds with IEP's	.10%
✓ % of students attending school on-grounds as county POS student	44%

Child Center of Our Lady- Central Region
Normandy School District

Total # of Students in Residence	<u>24</u>
Total # of Resident Students attending on-campus school	17
Total # of Resident Students with POS IEP at on-campus school	5
Total # of Resident Students in Normandy schools without IEP's	3
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to Normandy schools	4
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's in SSD schools	0
<hr/>	
✓ % of students who attend school off grounds	29%
✓ % of students who attend off-grounds with IEP's	17%
✓ % of students attending school on-grounds as county POS student	21%

St. Vincents- Central Region
Normandy School District

Total # of Students in Residence	<u>33</u>
Total # of Resident Students attending on-campus school	29
Total # of Resident Students with POS IEP at on-campus school	4
Total # of Resident Students in Normandy schools without IEP's	4
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to Norman. schools	0
Total # of Resident Students with IEP's going to SSD Schools	0
<hr/>	
✓ % of students who attend school off-grounds	12%
✓ % of students who attend off grounds with IEP's	0
✓ % of students attending school on-grounds as county POS student	14%