



Special School District

Purchase of Services
Program Update.

Paul Bauer

Board Approved: July 19, 2011

Purchase of Services Update

Executive Summary

SSD completed an evaluation of the Purchase of Services program during the 2006-08 school year. A recommendation of that evaluation was that SSD continue to monitor the processes and student performance in those agencies. This update to the Board of Education provides information about each agency's performance on SSD's Quality Indicators, indicators from the State Performance Plan, Missouri Grade Level Assessments, End of Course Exams, and MAP-A, and additional measure of accountability.

The following are based on this review:

Strengths

1. In general, State Assessment scores are improving. When scores for students in attendance for one year or more are considered, four of seven agencies improved or had a high score in Communication Arts and six of seven did so in Math.
2. At six of eight agencies, student attendance is improving.
3. With all but one agency reporting, students in every agency are meeting more than 70% of the IEP goals.
4. All agencies comply with requirements for Transition Planning in IEPs.
5. Six agencies showed a decrease in out-of-school suspensions or no out-of-school suspensions.
6. Enrollment in POS agencies has decreased substantially (by almost 37%) over the last five years.

Opportunities for Growth

1. Although State Assessment scores are improving, they are still very low. Given that the Index Score for "Below Basic" is "600" and the Index Score for "Basic" is "700", agencies' Index Scores show that the majority of students are scoring in those two score ranges.
2. At only 6 of 8 agencies did students show academic growth. Students at one agency did not show sufficient academic growth, and another agency used no system to show students' academic growth.
3. Students at three agencies did not show sufficient therapeutic growth, and another agency used no system to show therapeutic growth.
4. Post-secondary status of graduates is either poor or could not be determined because graduates could not be located.
5. Half of the eight agencies did not meet criteria for both indicators of student placement in the LRE.

Recommendations

1. Work collaboratively with agencies individually and as a group to develop a system for continuously monitoring processes and student outcomes.
2. Meet with agencies individually and as a group in a "data team" format to identify current progress on meeting key indicators of student performance, areas needing attention, and plans to address them.
3. Establish "System-to-System" conversations between individual agencies and SSD administration to continually improve program implementation and student outcomes.
4. Continue to explore options within public schools to continue to decrease the number of students enrolled in POS agencies.
5. Work collaboratively with Giant Steps and Center for Autism Education to identify or develop formative measures of student progress.

6. Adopt a common measure of student therapeutic progress for POS agencies and special education programs in public special schools.
7. Submit to the Board of Education an update of information on each agency each January (with information from first semester) and June (with information for the full year).

I. Program/Service Information

1. Name of Program or Services: Purchase of Services
2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program (list):
Paul Bauer
Pablo Flinn
3. Demographic Description of Program:
Location(s): Seven Sites: Every Child's Hope/ECH (previously Evangelical Children's Home)
Edgewood Children's Center
Epworth School
St. Vincent's Home
Marygrove
LOGOS School
Giant Steps
Center for Autism Education
4. Goal/Objective of Program/Services: The Purchase of Services (POS) program provides services to students in need of (a) educational and therapeutic environment or (b) a highly specialized program that is not readily available in a traditional school setting. The IEP team determines an appropriate level of service for the student at the IEP meeting.
5. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:
MSIP 6.3.4: The district has implemented effective instructional programs designed to meet the assessed needs of its students, as well as the practices and procedures needed to support these programs. The district identifies and provides targeted instruction or other needed services/interventions for educationally-disadvantaged, ESOL, migrant, and homeless students, as well as students who may, for other reasons, be at risk of leaving school without completing high school.
Goal I: Student Performance: Develop and enhance quality educational/instructional programs to improve performance and enable students to meet their personal, academic and career goals.

II. Data Reviewed

State assessment data
Enrollment data
Attendance rate
Dropout rate
Suspension rate
Movement to LRE
Students' IEP
Agency assessment data
Student Schedules
Curriculum Guides

III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Name	Role
Paul Bauer	Director
Pablo Flinn	Area Coordinator

IV. Background Information

In June 2006 the Board approved an evaluation of the POS program. After Board approval, it was decided that SSD staff would continue to monitor agencies to ensure they met SSD's program and student outcome requirements. Initially, the monitoring consisted of a review of agency data according to the following "Quality Indicators":

- a. QI #44 Evidence supports students are making academic progress (aggregate data show positive academic progress and individual data show at 50% of students making therapeutic progress)
- b. QI #45 Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress (aggregate data show positive therapeutic progress and individual data show at 50% of students making therapeutic progress)
- c. QI #46 There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow-up (Systematic collection procedure for follow-up on students exiting program or movement to LRE, wrap-around/after-care services available to students after they leave program, and aggregate follow-up data for school improvement)
- d. QI #47 Rate of return to Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) (total number and percentage of students) is equal to or greater than 20% each year
- e. QI #48 Rate of return to LRE (total number & percentage of students returning to a lesser restrictive environment) increases yearly.

In November, 2008, it was determined that the process of monitoring agencies would change from the above indicators to a review of agency performance based on DESE's State Performance Plan. This review would be based upon the following SPP Indicators:

- a. SPP #2 - Dropout rate
- b. SPP #3C – Proficiency rate for students with IEPs (Because of the low number of students participating in State Assessments at each agency, the Index Score was used to show changes in performance. This measure is sensitive to changes in performance but does not report numbers or percentages of students in each category. It therefore prevents the possibility of identifying individual students in reviewing scores.)
- c. SPP #5 – Percent of children removed from regular class (This was modified to show the rate of return of students to the LRE.)
- d. SPP#13 – Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
- e. SPP#14 - Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school, and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within six months of leaving high school.

Other items for review would include:

- a. student schedules in September to ensure IEP and courses match the student schedule
- b. updating, revising, showing progress on School Improvement Plan in October and June
- c. Social-Emotional Behavior forms showing therapeutic intervention
- d. Student progress on IEP goals

This update contains information for each agency for each of the above indicators. In reviewing the charts on the following pages, the following should be kept in mind:

1. The following data were added this year as a means to measure via the IEP process the progress students were making in their placement and assignment: performance on goals, length of stay, attendance, and out-of-school suspensions.
2. Not all indicators apply to all agencies: for example, SPP items #13 and #14 apply only to agencies with high school students.
3. Due to the change from using Quality Indicators to using SPP Indicators, not all data are reported for every year.
4. Additional considerations for individual agencies are noted on the pages following the charts.
5. Data on performance on State Assessments is summarized on a separate page.

Enrollments

The following table shows enrollment in POS agencies since 2007.

Purchase of Service - Enrollment Numbers

SCHOOL	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Center for Autism	4	3	1	1	1
Edgewood	25	37	38	39	42
Epworth	22	21	28	29	48
ECH (Evangelical)	11	12	12	17	21
Giant Steps	9	13	14	14	15
Logos*	33	30	33	37	33
Marygrove	9	8	11	7	9
St. Vincent's	4	8	9	14	16
Total	117	132	146	158	185

* The student count for Logos includes graduates from term 6 (after ESY)

The above table shows that enrollment in POS agencies has dropped substantially over the last five years. This may attributed to (1) improved and expanded programming in public schools for students with Emotional Disturbance or Autism and (2) increased diligence in ensuring that students are unable to meet success in public schools before consider private separate schools.

State Assessments

The following pages summarize performance on State Assessments for the last three years. Due to the small number of students tested on some agencies, the percentage of students in each score category is not reported: doing so would enable a reader to associate specific scores with individual students. Rather, the charts show Index Scores. The Index Score is obtained by considering the percentage of students in each score category. It is sensitive to student growth in all categories and provides an aggregate number. Scores shown are divided into two groups: One group includes all students taking the test (comparable to the DESE Annual Performance Review); the other group includes only students at their agency for one year or more. The latter is comparable to scores used to show Adequate Yearly Progress, and is based on the premise that schools should not be held accountable for students who not have participated in their programs for a full year.)

**Index Scores
All Students Enrolled
2008-2010**

Communication Arts

	Index	Index	Index
Agency	2008	2009	2010
Edgewood	614.8	642.8	622.9
Epworth	653.3	633.3	650.7
ECH (Evangelical)	610.0	633.3	640.0
LOGOS	644.2	671.4	699.3
Marygrove	625.0	657.4	600.0
St. Vincent	625.0	600.0	700.0
Giant Steps	700.0	750.0	900.0
Center for Autism	NA	NA	600.0

Mathematics

Math	Index	Index	Index
Agency	2008	2009	2010
Edgewood	628.5	621.4	635.2
Epworth	647.0	609.9	633.3
ECH (Evangelical)	625.0	616.7	649.8
LOGOS	675.0	614.3	649.9
Marygrove	660.0	620.0	616.7
St. Vincent	616.7	600.0	700.0
Giant Steps	770.6	900.0	900.0
Center for Autism	NA	NA	600.0

1. Tables above include scores for all students who took the MAP, EOC, or MAP-A.
2. Tables show increase (green) in Index Score each year over the previous year and decrease (red) each year from previous year.
3. Maximum Index Score possible is 900.
4. Center for Autism reported scores only for 2010.

**Index Scores
Students Enrolled One Year or More
2008-2010**

Communication Arts

	Index	Index	Index
Agency	2008	2009	2010
Edgewood	647.7	645.5	621.4
Epworth	657.2	636.4	650.7
ECH (Evangelical)	600.0	640.0	600.0
LOGOS	645.4	650.0	700.0
Marygrove	625.0	650.0	600.0
St. Vincent	600.0	600.0	700.0
Giant Steps	700.0	750.0	900.0
Center for Autism	NA	NA	600.0

Mathematics

	Index	Index	Index
Agency	2008	2009	2010
Edgewood	609.9	626.6	627.9
Epworth	625.0	611.1	636.4
ECH (Evangelical)	612.5	620.0	600.0
LOGOS	642.9	616.7	661.5
Marygrove	625.0	600.0	620.0
St. Vincent	600.0	600.0	700.0
Giant Steps	770.6	900.0	900.0
Center for Autism	NA	NA	600.0

1. Tables above include scores only for students enrolled one year or more in each agency
2. Tables show increase (green) in Index Score each year over the previous year and decrease (red) each year from previous year.
3. Maximum Index Score possible is 900.
4. Center for Autism obtained scores only in 2010.

Evaluation Data

The following pages contain charts showing evaluation data for each agency. The following should be noted in viewing these charts:

1. Findings for Academic Progress and Therapeutic Progress are based on the percentage of students enrolled in the agency for the entire year who showed progress on a pre- and post-measure.
2. The “Length of Stay” average is only for students at each agency prior to August 2010. The numbers listed are (a) average number of years at that agency and (b) number of students in the sample.

3. During the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years, agencies were monitored with the Quality Indicators. Data for those years are included in the charts. Starting in the 2008-09 school year, SSD monitored with the indicators from the State Performance Plan. As a result, each chart contains cells with no information. This is because during those years, information for other indicators was collected. This update reports data for all indicators used (both Quality Indicators and State Performance Plan indicators).
4. Data for SPP Indicator #14 (post-graduate follow-up) shows status of graduates six months after graduation. Data for 2011 graduates will be collected in November, 2011 and has not yet been collected. Not every agency has graduates every year – for years with no graduate, the agency is marked “NA”. In addition, an agency having “0” in this category is typically because the graduates could not be located.
5. The charts contain some data that are neither in the SPP or the Quality Indicators. These data include (a) Percentage of growth on social/emotional/behavior IEP goals, (b) Percentage of growth on all IEP goals, (c) Number of Incidents of Out-Of-School Suspension (OSS), (d) Number of days of OSS given, (e) Average Daily Attendance, and (f) Average length of stay at the agency. These data were collected and reported because, with the exception of growth on IEP goals, these are indicators for which public schools are accountable. Growth on IEP goals was collected as another means of reporting student progress.
6. The chart for Giant Steps notes that that agency has adopted curriculum guides for all core academic content areas as indicated on the previous evaluation.

Epworth

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress	YES	YES				YES
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress	YES	NO				YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up	YES	NO				YES
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly	YES 25%	NO 11%	YES 22%	NO 10%	YES 13%	Yes 36%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			0%	3.40%	0%	4.10%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			50%	NA	0%	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						98%
% of growth on all IEP goals						99%
Number of incidents requiring OSS				67	57	12
Number of days of OSS given				96	84	21
Avg daily attendance				82.11%	83.78%	88.27%
Avg Length of stay in agency						3.25 yrs (9)

Edgewood

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress	NO	YES				YES
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress	YES	NO				YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up	NO	NO				NO
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly	YES 8%	YES 23%	NO 9%	NO 3%	YES 14%	Yes 27%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			0%	3%	7.90%	0%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			NA	100%	NA	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						88%
% of growth on all IEP goals						84%
Number of incidents requiring OSS				4	3	0
Number of days of OSS given				8	4	0
Avg daily attendance				92.25%	90.85%	92.88%
Avg Length of stay in agency						2.7 yrs (13)

Every Child's Hope (Evangelical)

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
<i>44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress</i>	YES	NO				YES
<i>45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress</i>	YES	NO				NO
<i>46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up</i>	NO	NO				NO
<i>47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year</i>	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
<i>48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly</i>	YES 20%	NO 8.5%	YES 19%	YES 20%	NO 14%	NO 11%
<i>SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities</i>			0%	15%	8.30%	0%
<i>SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals</i>				100%	100%	100%
<i>SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school</i>			NA	100%	NA	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
<i>% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals</i>						86%
<i>% of growth on all IEP goals</i>						80%
<i>Number of incidents requiring OSS</i>				12	24	25
<i>Number of days of OSS given</i>				55	59	65
<i>Avg daily attendance</i>				83.12%	84.32%	86.45%
<i>Avg Length of stay in agency</i>						1.25 yrs (2)

LOGOS

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress	YES	YES				YES
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress	YES	NO				YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up	YES	NO				NO
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly	NO 7%	NO 3.4%	YES 5%	YES 8%	NO 0%	Yes 8%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			5%	3%	6%	0%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			0%	20%	67%	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						DATA PENDING*
% of growth on all IEP goals						DATA PENDING*
Number of incidents requiring OSS				167	74	41
Number of days of OSS given				175	75	65
Avg daily attendance				82.56%	89.97%	89.86%
Avg Length of stay in agency						2.8 yrs (18)

- LOGOS operates on six terms per year. Data are collected at the end of their school year in late July.

Marygrove

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress	NO	YES				YES
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress	YES	NO				YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up	YES	NO				YES
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly	YES 25%	NO 43%	NO 22%	NO 15%	YES 27%	NO 14%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			0%	0%	0%	0%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			0%	NA	NA	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						75%
% of growth on all IEP goals						77%
Number of incidents requiring OSS				1	4	7
Number of days of OSS given				3	6	7
Avg daily attendance				92.36%	96.08%	95.63%
Avg Length of stay in agency						1.9 yrs (6)

St. Vincent's

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress	YES	NO				NO
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress	NO	NO				YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up	NO	YES				NO
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly	YES 8%	YES 10%	YES 36%	NO 18%	YES 20%	Yes 80%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			0%	11%	12.50%	0%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			NA	NA	NA	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						100%
% of growth on all IEP goals						73%
Number of incidents requiring OSS				24	10	2
Number of days of OSS given				56	17	2
Avg daily attendance				80.59%	88.90%	91.44%
Avg Length of stay in agency						1.2 yrs (1)

Giant Steps

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress						YES
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress						YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up						YES
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year			NO	NO	NO	YES
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly			NO 0%	NO 0%	NO 7%	YES 33%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			0%	0%	0%	0%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			NA	NA	NA	To Be Collected Nov. 2011
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						67%
% of growth on all IEP goals						87%
Number of incidents requiring OSS				0	0	0
Number of days of OSS given				0	0	0
Avg daily attendance				90.30%	94.88%	95.33%
Avg Length of stay in agency						7.28 yrs (8)

NOTE: Agency now has curriculum guides for all four academic core areas.

Center for Autism Education

Quality Indicator	6/1/2006	6/1/2007	6/1/2008	6/1/2009	6/1/2010	6/1/2011
44: Evidence supports students are making academic progress						NO DATA PROVIDED
45: Evidence supports students are making therapeutic progress						YES
46: There is evidence of meaningful post-program follow up						NA
47 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE is equal to or greater than 20% each school year			NO	NO	NO	NO
48 / SPP # 5: Rate of return to LRE increases yearly			NO 0%	NO 0%	NO 0%	NO 0%
SPP # 2 Dropout rate for students with disabilities			0%	0%	0%	0%
SPP # 13 Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonable enable students to meet post secondary goals				100%	100%	100%
SPP # 14 Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school			NA	NA	NA	NA
% of growth on social, emotional, behavioral IEP goals						100%
% of growth on all IEP goals						94%
Number of incidents requiring OSS				0	0	0
Number of days of OSS given				0	0	0
Avg daily attendance				99.14%	96.10%	96.50%
Avg Length of stay in agency						3.62 yrs (2)

Based upon the above data, the following may be noted:

Strengths

1. In general, State Assessment scores are improving. When scores for students in attendance for one year or more are considered, four of seven agencies improved or had a high score in Communication Arts and six of seven did so in Math.
2. At six of eight agencies, student attendance is improving.
3. With all but one agency reporting, students in every agency are meeting more than 70% of the IEP goals.
4. All agencies comply with requirements for Transition Planning in IEPs.
5. Six agencies showed a decrease in out-of-school suspensions or no out-of-school suspensions.
6. Enrollment in POS agencies has decreased substantially (by almost 37%) over the last five years.

Opportunities for Growth

1. Although State Assessment scores are improving, they are still very low. Given that the Index Score for “Below Basic” is “600” and the Index Score for “Basic” is “700”, agencies’ Index Scores show that the majority of students are scoring in those two score ranges.
2. At only 6 of 8 agencies did students show academic growth. Students at one agency did not show sufficient academic growth, and another agency used no system to show students’ academic growth.
3. Students at three agencies did not show sufficient therapeutic growth, and another agency used no system to show therapeutic growth.
4. Based on 2010 graduates, only three agencies were required to do follow-up of graduates. Post-secondary status of graduates is either poor or could not be determined because graduates could not be located.
5. Half of the eight agencies did not meet criteria for both indicators of student placement in the LRE.

Recommendations

1. Work collaboratively with agencies individually and as a group to develop a system for continuously monitoring processes and student outcomes.
2. Meet with agencies individually and as a group in a “data team” format to identify current progress on meeting key indicators of student performance, areas needing attention, and plans to address them.
3. Establish “System-to-System” conversations between individual agencies and SSD administration to continually improve program implementation and student outcomes.
4. Continue to explore options within public schools to continue to decrease the number of students enrolled in POS agencies.
5. Work collaboratively with Giant Steps and Center for Autism Education to identify or develop formative measures of student progress.
6. Adopt a common measure of student therapeutic progress for POS agencies. The measure should be consistent with measures used in special education programs in public schools.
7. Submit to the Board of Education an update of information on each agency each January (with information from first semester) and June (with information for the full year).