



Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?

Goal 1: Improve performance on state assessments. (Goal 1 data was reported on the mid-year evaluation and is included here for review.)

Measurable Objective 1:	1.1 Agencies will improve MSIP 4 Index scores compared to last year
-------------------------	---

Results: Six of the eight agencies improved their index score on the 2012 Communication Arts Index. One of the agencies was virtually the same with a 2011 index score of 655.6 and a 2012 index score of 655. One agency’s score declined in the area of Communication Arts. On the Math index four of the eight agencies showed increase over the index scores of 2011. Three of the agencies’ scores dropped from 2011 to 2012. One agency did not have a 2011 score and therefore, could not be compared to 2012 data.

MSIP 4 Index					
Communication Arts					
Site	2009	2010	2011	2012	2012(N) *
Center for Autism	N/A	600	600	750	2
Edgewood	640	650	700	647	15
Epworth	633	600	656	655	13
Every Child’s Hope	625	600	600	700	3
Giant Steps	750	900	733	800	3
Logos School	686	709	690	729	14
Marygrove	675	614	617	633	3
St. Vincent’s	633	N/A	700	767	3
Math					
Site	2009	2010	2011	2012	2012(N) *
Center for Autism	N/A	600	900	750	2
Edgewood	617	650	670	613	15
Epworth	622	611	633	636	12
Every Child’s Hope	625	600	600	733	4
Giant Steps	900	900	833	825	4
Logos School	614	655	613	644	17
Marygrove	633	629	617	667	3
St. Vincent’s	600	N/A	N/A	684	3

*Number of students

Agencies improved	Number	Percent
Communication Arts	6	75.0%
Math	4	50.0%

Measurable Objective 2:	1.2 Agencies will improve percent of students proficient or advanced compared to last year
-------------------------	--

Results: Six of the agencies improved the percent of proficient or advanced students with an overall increase in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced in Communication Arts of 87%. In Math, 4 agencies improved the percent of proficient or advanced students by 57.1%.

Percent Proficient or Advanced				
Site	Content	2011	2012	N 2012*
Center for Autism	Communication Arts	0	50.0	2
Center for Autism	Mathematics	100	50.0	2
Edgewood	Communication Arts	29.41	13.3	15
Edgewood	Mathematics	25	0.0	15
Epworth	Communication Arts	22.22	30.8	13
Epworth	Mathematics	0	16.7	12
Every Child's Hope	Communication Arts	0	66.7	3
Every Child's Hope	Mathematics	0	50.0	4
Giant Steps	Communication Arts	33.33	66.7	3
Giant Steps	Mathematics	100	75.0	4
Logos	Communication Arts	30	50.0	14
Logos	Mathematics	0	11.8	17
Marygrove	Communication Arts	0	0.0	3
Marygrove	Mathematics	0	33.3	3
St. Vincent's	Communication Arts	0	66.7	3.0
St. Vincent's	Mathematics	NA	0.0	0.0

*Number of students

Agencies improved	Number	Percent
Communication Arts	6	75.0%
Math	4	50.0%

Goal 2: Show Improvement on quarterly measures

Measurable Objective 1:	2.1 Improve attendance each quarter.			
Results: Five of seven (71%) agencies improved from Q1 to Q2. Four of seven (57%) improved from Q2 to Q3. Three of seven (43%) improved from Q3 to Q4.				
Attendance by Quarter				
Agency	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Center for Autism	93.9%	92.6%	98.0%	96.5%
Edgewood	90.8%	91.1%	93.8%	92.8%
Epworth	95.3%	93.0%	93.4%	91.6%
Evangelical Children's	91.9%	92.7%	92.2%	84.7%
Giant Steps	93.3%	95.3%	95.1%	95.7%
Logos School	89.4%	89.8%	86.3%	90.4%
Marygrove	94.0%	96.1%	97.0%	98.4%

Measurable Objective 2:	2.2 Show academic growth each quarter.			
Results: One measure used to measure growth each quarter is the Children’s Global Assessment Scale (CGAS) which is a numeric scale (1 through 100) used to rate the general functioning of children. CGAS measures are used to evaluate how a student adapts and performs to everyday tasks. It is not an academic measure, but is relevant for the POS agencies whose goals are therapeutic as well as academic. Agencies report students’ academic growth in the areas of Reading and Math. Each agency chooses which assessment tool(s) that they use to measure academic progress. The data for the year-end report compares 1 st quarter to 4 th quarter.				
Quarterly Progress				
CGAS				
Agency	Declined	Maintained	Improved	Percent Improving
Center for Autism	0	3	0	0.0%
ECH	0	2	5	71.4%
Edgewood	1	0	18	94.7%
Epworth	7	0	4	36.4%
Giant Steps	0	6	0	0.0%
Logos	1	0	17	94.4%
Marygrove	2	0	3	60%

Reading				
	Declined	Maintained	Improved	Percent Improving
Center of Autism	0	3	0	0.0%
ECH	0	0	7	100.0%
Edgewood	1	0	7	87.5%
Epworth	NA	NA	NA	NA
Giant Steps	1	1	4	66.6%
Logos	1	4	14	73.6%
Marygrove	0	1	4	80.0%

Math				
	Declined	Maintained	Improved	Percent Improving
Center for Autism	0	3		0.0%
ECH	0	0	4	100.0%
Edgewood	0	2	1	33.3%
Epworth	NA	NA	NA	NA
Giant Steps	2	2	1	20.0%
Logos	2	2	13	76.5%
Marygrove	0	0	5	100.0%

Measurable Objective 3:	2.3 Show progress on IEP goals each quarter.
-------------------------	--

Results: Since IEP goals are highly individualized, the socio-emotional goals were selected as the most appropriate measure to calculate progress.

POS AGENCY IEP GOAL PROGRESS				
AGENCY	Declined	Maintained	Improved	Percent Improving
Center of Autism	0	2	1	33.3%
Every Child's Hope	0	0	4	100.0%
Edgewood	3	3	10	62.5%
Epworth	0	2	8	80.0%
Giant Steps	0	3	0	0.0%
Logos	0	10	4	28.5%
Marygrove	0	2	2	50%

Goal 3: Meet appropriate targets for placement in POS Agencies

Measurable Objective 1:	3.1 Decrease enrollment at each site as measured by end of year enrollment.						
Results: In June, 2012 there were 93 students being served in POS agencies. In June 2013 there were 81 students being served in POS agencies. There has been a 12.9% decline in students at POS agencies since June of 2012.							
Year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Total	185	158	146	132	117	93	81

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total	185	158	146	132	117	93

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Center for Autism	1	1	1	3	4	3	3
Edgewood	42	39	38	37	25	23	20
Epworth	48	29	28	21	22	20	15
ECH	21	17	12	12	11	6	10
Giant Steps*	15	14	14	13	9	8	8
Logos	33	37	33	30	33	24	18
Marygrove	9	7	11	8	9	6	7
St. Vincent	16	14	9	8	4	3	0
Total	185	158	146	132	117	93	81

* Four students at Giant Steps spend a portion of their day in a less restrictive environment. One attends Neuwoehner and three attend partner district schools.

Note: Objective 2 results were reported in the mid-year evaluation.

What do key staff and stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?

Board Approved: 6/11/2013

Strengths

- Regular scheduled meetings with Agency directors were held throughout the 2012-2013 school year where the following was shared and discussed; district policies and procedures, improving academic performance, and SSD expectations for students in POS agencies.
- Sharing of mid-year program evaluation with POS directors with guided discussion to align district goal of LRE.
- Attendance at 6 out of 7 POS agencies was over 90% in quarter 4.
- Improvement in CGAS scores indicate that students in POS are responding to therapeutic interventions in POS agencies.
- Numbers of students in POS Agencies are monitored on a regular basis and discussions regarding LRE are held with agency directors.
- Meeting with one agency to discuss evaluation plan increased cooperation with SSD to meet students' needs.

Opportunities/Weaknesses

- We do not have a good measure for quality of therapy or effectiveness of therapy. Currently, the CGAS provides a global functioning measure for each student, but we will consider other options that would provide more discrete information for programming for social/emotional/behavioral needs.
- Goal data continues to be area of opportunity. Data is inconsistently reported by agencies. Agencies tend to use daily point sheet data that doesn't always align with IEP goals.
- Increasing area coordinator and partner district attendance at annual IEP to provide collaboration for programmatic planning

How well aligned are the program's priorities and processes with the goals of the program?

The program priorities and process are well aligned with the goals of the program.

Deployment Level of Program Services: Select the most appropriate level.

Should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals? Yes No

Should goals be changed, added or removed? Yes No

If Yes describe the changes to goals listed.

Goal 2: Show Improvement on quarterly measures should be revised to find a better time frame to demonstrate improvement in student achievement. IEP goals and some of the formative assessments are not evaluated on a quarterly basis. Work with agencies on a schedule similar to SSD's and to identify better assessments?

Evaluation Implications

General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation

Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.

Review of Status of Mid-Year Evaluation.

In an attempt to establish consistent measures for the final two reporting periods, the POS coordinator will meet individually with the agency directors to review how academic progress is reported.

POS coordinator met individually with agency directors. Meetings will continue on a bi-monthly basis next school year.

Investigate the possibility of using the same formative assessments as SSD Schools.

In the 2013-2014 school year the agencies will be trained on the English Language Arts Skills Checklist (ELASC) and Math Skills Checklist (MSC) for those students who are MAP-A Eligible. For students who take Grade Level Assessments or End of Course Exams, the STAR assessment will be utilized, contingent on licensing. This system will provide a uniformed formative measure for all SSD students in POS agencies.

Provide training to POS agencies in the areas of Math and English Language Arts instruction.

Agencies have been provided two dates for the 2013-2014 school year of specific training. Additionally, agencies have been and will continue to be notified of training opportunities available within the district.

Establish meetings with each individual agency to review data and establish procedure for evaluation using the DESE Standards to Approve Private Agencies.

At the April agency meeting the DESE approval checklist was shared and discussed with agency directors. Agencies completed a self-review using the DESE checklist and provided that review to the POS coordinator.

Develop a rubric that guides what criteria are used to place students in particular agencies.

The frame work for the rubric has been drafted and is in progress. The rubric currently contains the following info: geographic location, staff to student ratio, therapy to student ratio, specialized program, secure/locked classroom, disabilities served, ages served, and the general amount of individual and group therapy. This tool is to be used as an internally and is a guide when looking at agency placement.

Action Plans

- Explore a variety of formative assessments for social/emotional/behavioral including the Achenbach.
- Move the POS evaluation schedule from January and June, to February and July to allow time for more complete and accurate data.
- Continue the use DESE Standards Checklist with specific focus on curriculum and instruction.
- If goal progress continues to be reported on a quarterly basis, develop a tool to support this data collection.
- Develop training for agency staff on developing goals for IEP and data collection.
- Consider movement on the continuum to LRE as a result measure
- Increase attendance of partner district area coordinators and partner district school staff at annual IEP's

Cost and Funding Source

The costs of the program are included in the budget.