



Standard Program and Service Evaluation

REORGANIZATION PLAN

Program Evaluation Question(s)

- 1) Did the reorganization, which occurred in the Special Education Division, result in a more responsive communication to parents and partner districts?
- 2) Did the reorganization, which occurred in the Special Education Division, result in providing the technical expertise, support and service for students, parents and staff?

I. Program/Service Information:

1. Name of Program or Services: Reorganization Plan of Special Education
Reorganization Plan of Special Education which was endorsed by the Board of Education on March 19, 2002 and was instituted beginning with the FY '03-'04.
2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation (list):
Joan Zavitsky
3. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):
Sept. 2004-June 2005
4. Goal/Objective of Program/Services:
The goals of the reorganization were:
 - Maximize quality service and responsiveness by minimizing the number of buildings supported by a coordinator.
 - Bring all services and decisions closer to the student
 - Provide and expand direct and indirect technical expertise, support and service for students, parents and staff to enhance student achievement.
 - Provide more responsive communication for parents and partner districts.
5. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:
One of the goals of the reorganization was to provide and expand direct and indirect technical expertise, support and service for students, parents and staff to enhance student achievement. This goal is related to MSIP standard and indicator 7.1 comprehensive service for all resident children with disabilities, as required by IDEA. Achievement of this goal in part is by providing the necessary support to students with disabilities in their classrooms.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation

6. Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s): Reorganization Plan for Special Education Services is countywide.

Number of staff: 2,419.64 certified staff and 1,810 non-certified staff

Length of program/service: The Board of Education endorsed the Reorganization Plan on March 19, 2002 with an implementation date of FY'03-'04. Since the reorganization occurred surveys have been systematically sent out as a part of our ongoing continuous improvement process. The surveys are sent to various stakeholders (SSD administrators and teachers, Partner District administrators and parents) to determine their satisfaction with the organizational structure, services and responsiveness.

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

Joan Zavitsky, Assoc. Supt.

Chip Jones, Exec. Director

Linda Shemwell, Exec. Director

Mary Ann Tietjens, Exec. Director

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

X SSD Staff (Area Coordinator, Teacher) Survey Results

X Parent Survey Results

X Partner District Admin. (Supt., Liaison, Principal) Survey Results

IV. Data Collection Methodology

X SSD Staff (Area Coordinator, Teachers) Surveys

X Parent Surveys

X Partner District Admin. (Supt., Liaison, Principal) Surveys



Standard Program and Service Evaluation

V. Results

A satisfaction survey was sent to all Area Coordinators (Nov.'03 & '04) return rate of 73% and 68% respectively, Partner District Principals (Nov. '03 & '04) with a return rate of 41% each year, Liaisons (Nov.'03 & '04) with a return rate of 70% and 66% respectively, and SSD Teachers (Nov.'03 &'04) with a return rate of 58% and 46% respectively. In addition, a survey was sent to random sample parents 1,500 in 2003 with a return rate of 12% and 6,100 in 2004 with a return rate of 11%. The responses to the surveys were a on a likert scale of 1(strongly disagree) thru 5 (strongly agree). The survey asked questions of each group about technical expertise, diagnostic services, coordination of services, responsiveness to questions or concerns, IEP process and overall process. For purposes of this program evaluation questions I will only discuss three areas from the survey: 1) technical expertise, 2) coordination of services and 3) responsiveness to questions or concerns.

- 1) Did the reorganization, which occurred in the Special Education Division, result in a more responsive communication to parents and partner districts?

The results for responsiveness to questions or concerns were (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree):

	2003	2004
Area Coordinator	3.9	4.0*
Partner District Principal	3.7	3.7
Liaison	3.7	3.9
SSD Teacher	3.6	3.7
Parent	3.7	3.9

*= Statistically significant difference between years 2003 and 2004.

- 2) Did the reorganization, which occurred in the Special Education Division, result in providing the technical expertise, support and service for students, parents and staff?

The results for technical expertise were (1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree):

	2003	2004
Area Coordinator -	3.8	4.0 *
Partner District Principal	3.9	3.8
Liaison	3.9	3.9
SSD Teacher	3.8	3.7
Parent	3.7	3.9

*=Statistically significant difference between years 2003 and 2004.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation

The results for coordination of services were (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree):

	2003	2004
Area Coordinator	3.8	3.8
Partner District Principal	3.8	3.7
Liaison	3.6	3.8
SSD Teacher	3.7	3.8*
Parent	3.7	3.9

*=Statistically significant between years 2003 and 2004.

Superintendent Satisfaction

A satisfaction survey was sent to all Superintendents (Nov. '03 & Nov. '04). The survey asked questions around their perception of responsiveness and involvement of SSD administrators in the start up of school activities. For purposes of this evaluation I will provide information on responsiveness of administrators and involvement in school activities.

The results of responsiveness of administrators were found in 2 questions listed below using a likert scale (1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree):

Question #	Year	N	Mean
Question #1 SSD admin. were able to address questions and needs quickly.	2003	19	4.4
	2004	22	3.8
Question #2 SSD admin. were able to resolve start of school issues effectively	2003	18	4.1
	2004	22	3.5
Question #3 How would you rate SSD admin. involvement in your school dist. (1=not involved; 5= very involved)	2003	18	3.9
	2004	22	3.8

:

* = Statistically significant differences between years 2003 and 2004.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation

A designation of strength was denoted when the results were >4.0 on the likert scale of 1-5 or there was a statistically positive increase. The designation of progressing was denoted when the results were 3.5 -4.0 on the likert scale of 1-5. A designation of concern was denoted when the results were <3.5 .

Question #1: Did the reorganization, which occurred in the Special Education Division, result in a more responsive communication to parents and partner districts?

1) Strengths

The overall results showed a statistically significant positive increase in satisfaction between 2003 and 2004 for the group of area coordinator staff with regard to the responsiveness to questions and concerns.

2) Progressing

The overall results showed a slight increase in satisfaction between 2003 and 2004 in the area of responsiveness to questions and concerns for the groups of partner district principal, liaison, teacher and parent. The superintendent group showed a slight decrease, but not statistically significant between 2003 and 2004 in the area of responsiveness.

3) Concerns

Overall there were no areas of concern since all ratings were at or above 3.5 on a likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Question #2: Did the reorganization, which occurred in the Special Education Division, result in providing the technical expertise, support and service for students, parents and staff?

1) Strength

-The overall for technical expertise a slight increase in satisfaction between 2003 and 2004 for the groups of area coordinator and parent.

-The overall satisfaction for the coordination of services has statistically significantly increased between the years of 2003 and 2004 for the SSD teacher.

2) Progressing

-The overall satisfaction in the area of technical expertise showed a slight decrease, but not statistically significant between 2003 and 2004 for the groups of partner district principal and SSD teacher. The rating by the partner district liaisons remained the same.

-The overall satisfaction for the coordination of services has positively increased for the parent and liaison groups. The rating by the area coordinator remained the same.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation

-The overall satisfaction for the coordination of services decreased, but not statistically significant between 2003 and 2004 for the group of partner district principal.

3) Concern

Overall there were no areas of concern for level of satisfaction for technical expertise or coordination of services by any group since all ratings were at or above 3.5 on a likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Recommendations

Although there were no concerns as a result of the findings of the program evaluation, there are four areas that indicated a slight decrease. One area was by the partner district principal regarding coordination of services. The other three areas were responses by the superintendent to the survey regarding responsiveness to questions, resolution to start of school issues and SSD involvement in the partner district schools. Since there was a decrease in the rating by the superintendents but the number is small we should be cautious in interpreting the results. The responses by the superintendents were shared with each director during the spring.

- 1) Send out survey to superintendents this year and do a comparison for the three years for each district.
- 2) Share and discuss the results of the superintendent's survey with the individual directors.
- 3) Each director should share and discuss the results with the special education administrators for their individual districts. Each director should develop strategies to increase the level of satisfaction by each superintendent about SSD's administrators for the specific areas of responsiveness, school start-up issues and involvement in the district.
- 4) Each director should share and discuss the results with their key contact at the partner district, either superintendent and/or liaison.
- 5) Share and discuss the results of the district principals survey with respect to coordination of services with the individual directors.
- 6) Each director should share and discuss the results with the special education administrators for their individual districts. Each director should develop strategies to increase the level of satisfaction by the partner district principals with respect to coordination of services.