



**Evaluation Results**

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

Goal 1: Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Requirements.

In reviewing these data, it should be noted that at this time state assessment results for the 2011-12 school year are not available. The following analyses were presented to the Board in January and are again presented to show performance of each agency. Results of 2012 state assessments are currently pending and will be shared in comparison to SSD public school and statewide results when then become available. The tables below show the percentage of students at each private separate school scoring Proficient or Advanced in 2011. The required percentages to make AYP were (a) 75.5% Proficient or Advanced for Communication Arts and (b) 72.5% Proficient or Advanced for Mathematics. The tables show that two agencies met the AYP criteria in Mathematics; none did so in Communication Arts. (It should be noted that the number of students at each agency is small and would not meet cell size requirements for AYP accountability.)

2011 MAP/MAP-A Scores  
 Percentage Proficient/Advanced

| Site               | Content Area       | Percentage Proficient/Advanced | 2012 Scores |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Center for Autism  | Communication Arts | 0.0                            | Pending     |
| Center for Autism  | Mathematics        | 100.0                          | Pending     |
| Edgewood           | Communication Arts | 29.41                          | Pending     |
| Edgewood           | Mathematics        | 25.00                          | Pending     |
| Epworth            | Communication Arts | 22.22                          | Pending     |
| Epworth            | Mathematics        | 0.0                            | Pending     |
| Every Child’s Hope | Communication Arts | 0.0                            | Pending     |
| Every Child’s Hope | Mathematics        | 0.0                            | Pending     |
| Giant Steps        | Communication Arts | 33.33                          | Pending     |
| Giant Steps        | Mathematics        | 100.00                         | Pending     |
| Logos              | Communication Arts | 30.00                          | Pending     |
| Logos              | Mathematics        | 0.00                           | Pending     |
| Marygrove          | Communication Arts | 0.00                           | Pending     |
| Marygrove          | Mathematics        | 0.00                           | Pending     |
| St. Vincent        | Communication Arts | 0.00                           | Pending     |
| St. Vincent        | Mathematics        | NA                             | Pending     |

Goal 2: Improve student performance on state assessments as measured by Index Scores. (NOTE: The following objectives are measured using the Index Score. The Index Score range is 600 – 900. The score is derived by adding the totals of (a) multiplying the percentage of students in the “Below Basic” range by 600, (b) multiplying the percentage of students in the “Basic” range by 700, (c) multiplying the percentage of students in the “Proficient” range by 800, and (d) multiplying the percentage of students in the “Advanced” range by 900.) The fifth cycle of MSIP (MSIP-5) uses a different method for calculating index scores, as well as determining progress and performance status. Results of 2012 testing are pending: the scores of agencies will be analyzed and compared to those of SSD public schools using the new scoring method when the 2012 scores become available.

Objective 1: To improve performance on Communication Arts State Assessment: Not Met. Three of eight sites increased their Index Scores from 2010 to 2011. Two showed no improvement, one showed a decrease, and one had no scores in 2010 for comparison. Over three years (2009 – 2011) four sites increased their Index Scores and three decreased. (One site did not have tests administered in 2009).

**Index Score by Year - Communication Arts**

| <b>Site</b>        | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Center for Autism  | N/A         | 600.0       | 600.0       | Pending     |
| Edgewood           | 640.0       | 650.0       | 700.0       | Pending     |
| Epworth            | 633.3       | 600.0       | 655.6       | Pending     |
| Every Child’s Hope | 625.0       | 600.0       | 600.0       | Pending     |
| Giant Steps        | 750.0       | 900.0       | 733.3       | Pending     |
| Logos School       | 685.7       | 709.1       | 690.0       | Pending     |
| Marygrove          | 675.0       | 614.3       | 616.7       | Pending     |
| St. Vincent’s      | 633.3       | N/A         | 700.0       | Pending     |

Objective 2: To improve performance on Mathematics State Assessment: Not Met. Three of eight sites increased their Index Scores from 2010 to 2011. One showed no improvement, two showed a decrease, and one had no scores in 2010 for comparison. Over three years (2009 – 2011) two sites increased their Index Scores and four decreased. (One site did not have tests administered in 2009 and one did not have tests administered in 2010 or 2011). As with Communication Arts, Mathematics test results are pending.

**Index Score by Year - Mathematics**

| Site               | 2009  | 2010  | 2011  | 2012    |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| Center for Autism  | N/A   | 600.0 | 900.0 | Pending |
| Edgewood           | 616.7 | 650.0 | 670.0 | Pending |
| Epworth            | 622.2 | 611.1 | 633.3 | Pending |
| Every Child's Hope | 625.0 | 600.0 | 600.0 | Pending |
| Giant Steps        | 900.0 | 900.0 | 833.3 | Pending |
| Logos School       | 614.3 | 654.5 | 612.5 | Pending |
| Marygrove          | 633.3 | 628.6 | 616.7 | Pending |
| St. Vincent's      | 600.0 | N/A   | N/A   | Pending |

## Enrollment

Objective 1: The number of students placed in private separate schools will decrease each year: Met. The following end-of-year enrollments from 2007 to 2012 show a decrease in the number of students each year. Since 2007, SSD has seen a decrease of students in this placement of almost 50%. Since last year, the decrease has been over 20%. It is noteworthy that for each agency, the number of SSD students has decreased. Statewide data are not available from DESE beyond 2010. However, from 2008 to 2010 the statewide number of students in POS placements decreased by about 24%, while the number of SSD students declined by about 16%.

### Enrollment Trends

| <u>School</u>     | <u>2007</u> | <u>2008</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012*</u> |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Center for Autism | 1           | 1           | 1           | 3           | 4           | 3            |
| Edgewood          | 42          | 39          | 38          | 37          | 25          | 23           |
| Epworth           | 48          | 29          | 28          | 21          | 22          | 20           |
| ECH               | 21          | 17          | 12          | 12          | 11          | 6            |
| Giant Steps       | 15          | 14          | 14          | 13          | 9           | 8            |
| Logos             | 33          | 37          | 33          | 30          | 33          | 24**         |
| Marygrove         | 9           | 7           | 11          | 8           | 9           | 6            |
| St. Vincent       | 16          | 14          | 9           | 8           | 4           | 3            |
| Total             | 185         | 158         | 146         | 132         | 117         | 93           |
| State             | ---         | 879         | 714         | 671         | ---         | --           |

\*2012 Data are as of June 1, 2012

\*\*Includes two students who will graduate upon completion of Summer session.

Objective 2: The percentage of students in each ethnic group placed in private separate schools will be comparable to district percentages. The table below shows enrollment in each private separate school as of June 2012. The distribution of students who are White, Black or Other ethnicity in private separate schools varies from the distribution of these students in SSD as a whole, and differs substantially from that of students with an IEP statewide.

**Enrollment by Race**

| School            | White  |            | Black  |            | Other  |            |
|-------------------|--------|------------|--------|------------|--------|------------|
|                   | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Center for Autism | 3      | 100.0      | 0      | 0          | 0      | 0          |
| Edgewood          | 15     | 65.2       | 8      | 34.8       | 0      | 0          |
| Epworth           | 5      | 25.0       | 15     | 75.0       | 0      | 0          |
| ECH               | 1      | 16.7       | 5      | 83.3       | 0      | 0          |
| Giant Steps       | 6      | 75.0       | 2      | 25.0       | 0      | 0          |
| Logos             | 21     | 87.5       | 2      | 8.3        | 1      | 4.2        |
| Marygrove         | 4      | 66.7       | 2      | 33.3       | 0      | 0          |
| St. Vincent       | 1      | 33.3       | 2      | 66.7       | 0      | 0          |
| Total             | 56     | 60.2       | 36     | 38.7       | 1      | 1.1        |
| State             | --     | 74.7       | --     | 17.1       | --     | 8.2        |
| SSD               | --     | 50.4       | --     | 40.3       | --     | 9.3        |

## **Progress Monitoring**

Each private separate school provides information on the following student performance indicators at the end of each quarter:

Reading Growth

Math Growth

Social/Emotional/Behavioral Growth as measured by the Children's Global Assessment Scale (C-GAS)

Growth on IEP Goals related to Social/Emotional/Behavioral Area

Attendance

Number of Days of Out-of-School Suspension (OSS)

Number of Incidents of Out-of-School Suspension

New Students at the start of the school year

Students leaving to go to a less restrictive environment (LRE)

Students dropped by the agency or leaving to go to a more restrictive environment (MRE)

The table on the following page contains these data. The data show that

1. At one school, no students showed growth in Reading over a year's time. At the other schools, up to 77% (at one school) of students showed growth. Overall, 48% of students showed some growth.
2. At one school, no students showed growth in Math. At the other schools, up to 100% (at one school) of students showed growth. Overall, 45% of students showed growth.
3. At one school, no students showed Social/Emotional/Behavioral growth as measured by the C-GAS. At the other schools up to 75% (at one school) showed growth. Overall 45% of students showed growth
4. Students at every agency showed growth on the Social/Emotional/Behavioral IEP goals. Overall, 72% showed growth in the second quarter and 63% showed growth in the fourth quarter.
5. All but one school had student attendance of 90% or better. Three schools met the AYP target of 93% attendance.
6. All but three schools suspended students out-of-school.
7. All but two agencies had new students this Fall; Every agency had students move to a less restrictive placement.

It should be noted in the following table that at some agencies Reading, Math, and Therapeutic Growth showed no increase. This does not mean that students were performing at the "zero percent" level: rather, it means that regardless of their level of performance, they did not show improvement.

## Progress Monitoring Indicators

| Agency                      | Reading Growth | Math Growth | Therapeutic Growth (C-GAS) | SEB IEP Goal Growth 2nd Q | SEB IEP Goal Growth 4th Q | Attendance    | OSS Days   | OSS Incidents | New Students YTD | Students Leaving to LRE | Students Leaving to MRE or 30 day drop |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Center for Autism Education | 0%             | 0%          | 67%                        | 100%                      | 88%                       | 94.75%        | 0          | 0             | 0                | 1                       | 0                                      |
| Edgewood                    | 60%            | 40%         | 32%                        | 64%                       | 62%                       | 91.14%        | 0          | 0             | 6                | 4                       | 1                                      |
| Epworth                     | 77%            | 54%         | 75%                        | 83%                       | 87%                       | 90.74%        | 11         | 3             | 12               | 11                      | 3                                      |
| Every Child's Hope          | 40%            | 60%         | 40%                        | 77%                       | 63%                       | 92.40%        | 32         | 14            | 4                | 3                       | 3                                      |
| Giant Steps                 | 43%            | 43%         | 0%                         | 88%                       | 60%                       | 95.97%        | 0          | 0             | 0                | 1                       | 0                                      |
| LOGOS                       | 30%            | 35%         | 57%                        | 72%                       | 52%                       | 87.90%        | 49         | 49            | 4                | 2                       | 3                                      |
| Marygrove                   | 67%            | 25%         | 25%                        | 62%                       | 38%                       | 93.66%        | 5          | 4             | 7                | 2                       | 0                                      |
| St. Vincent's               | 67%            | 100%        | 67%                        | 27%                       | 50%                       | 90.52%        | 11         | 9             | 2                | 1                       | 0                                      |
| <b>Totals</b>               | <b>48%</b>     | <b>45%</b>  | <b>45%</b>                 | <b>72%</b>                | <b>63%</b>                | <b>92.14%</b> | <b>108</b> | <b>79</b>     | <b>35</b>        | <b>25</b>               | <b>10</b>                              |

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

Strengths

- The number of SSD students in Private Separate Schools has declined substantially.
- The percentage of these students in Private Separate Schools who are Black is about the same as for SSD as a whole.
- Two schools showed improved students performance on state assessments in both Communication Arts and Mathematics.
- Although the percentage of students doing so at each agency varied, all schools reported that students made progress on their Social/Emotional/Behavioral IEP Goals and all but one reported progress as measured by the C-Gas.
- Three schools met the SSD attendance goals of 93%.

Opportunities/Weaknesses

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on state assessments is very low.
- Overall, fewer than half of students showed therapeutic growth as measured by the C-GAS, and less than three-quarters of students showed progress on SEB IEP goals.
- Fewer than half of students showed growth in Reading or Math
- The percentage of students who are White was higher than for SSD as a whole and lower than the state as a whole. This, combined with the small percentage of enrollment made up of students of other ethnicity meant that the percentage of SSD students in private separate schools who are Black is more than twice that of statewide enrollment.
- Although some agencies showed improved achievement as shown by state assessments and local assessments, student achievement is still low.

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

The program provides services to students needing a high amount of therapeutic support and intervention. The percentage of students showing growth on IEP goals indicates this is happening. However, the program does not align with SSD's goals to improve student achievement.

Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.

There is variation between deployment among agencies.

Should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?

Yes  No

If Yes describe change in priorities.

Separate Private Schools should increase emphasis on student performance and academic outcomes as well as therapeutic progress.

Should goals be changed, added or removed?

Yes  No

If Yes describe the changes to goals listed.





## Evaluation Implications

### **General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation**

Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- X Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other (Specify.)

- SSD staff will establish a plan and schedule for regular visits to each agency to (a) observe students, (b) observe implementation of IEPs and instructional programs, and (c) review agency data showing student progress. Resulting data will be reviewed when discussions of student placement or assignment take place.
- SSD staff should continue to monitor performance of students and of each agency and report to the Board or Education.
- DESE has recently published Standards to Approve Private Agencies. SSD staff should use these standards in reviewing and monitoring POS agencies.

### **Previous Recommendations**

1. Work collaboratively with agencies individually and as a group to develop a system for continually monitoring processes and student outcomes. During the 2011-12 school year, SSD administrators met with agency administrators quarterly to discuss instructional strategies and district expectations.
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. This took place during quarterly meetings.
3. Establish "System-to-System" conversations between individual agencies and SSD administration to continually improve program implementation and student outcomes. The SSD director met with each agency director individually in the Fall to review each agency's performance and SSD and DESE expectations.
4. Continue to explore options within public schools to continue to decrease the number of students enrolled in POS agencies. The special education schools, including the Bridges program, continue to access internal and external resources to improve program quality and flexibility. This enables those programs to educate students who otherwise would attend private separate schools.

5. Work collaboratively with Giant Steps and Center for Autism Education to identify or develop formative measures of student progress. During the 2011-12 school year, SSD revised its assessments for students who participate in the MAP-A and curriculum extensions. Plans are to share these assessment tools with agency staff before the start of 2012-13 school year.
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. All programs use the C-GAS for this measure.
7. Submit to the Board of Education an update of information on each agency each January and June. A report was submitted to the Board of Education in January 2012.