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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The program evaluation framework approved in 2003 by the Special School District’s Board of Education defines the process used to evaluate the Consolidated Federal Title Programs. The framework guides the district in conducting program evaluation activities to measure, analyze, and effectively manage programs and operations throughout the district. The Program Evaluation for the Consolidated Federal Programs took place from December 2004 to June 2005. The committee membership included a diverse group of teachers, parents, facilitators, and administrators from the special education schools, technical high schools, and partner districts who represented all the Federal Title grants (Appendix 1-1). The questions posed by the advisory committee and approved by the Board of Education were designed to provide a review of Special School District’s implementation of the Federal Programs.

The focus of the program evaluation was to answer the following questions approved by the Board of Education:

1. **What are the discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired implementation as identified by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist?**

2. **What is the extent of the discrepancies?**

Literature Review

The Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist (CFPSMC) (Appendix 3-1) is the central document used to determine proper implementation of the Consolidated Federal Programs. The grants Special School District receives funding for are: Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged, Title I.D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Delinquent and At-Risk Students, Title II.A: Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals, Title II.D: Enhancing Education Through Technology, Title IV.A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and Title V.A: Innovative Programs. The checklist guides implementation of the grants and defines “best practice.” State and federal mandates drive the CFPSMC guidance.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law provides the overall framework for the CFPSMC. All guidance must comply with state statutes, as well as with the tenants of
NCLB. Three additional sources of guidance that drive the checklist documentation come from the Federal Government: regulatory and non-regulatory policy guidance, regulations that are part of the Federal Register, and Secretary of Education letters in response to issues and questions that have arisen from the states.

Regulatory policy guidance are the federal statutes and all the regulations that go with them. The state must comply with all of the federal laws. Non-regulatory policy is policy that is suggested by the Department of Education, but does not have to be followed by the states. Non-regulatory policy guidance deals mainly with best practice and effective programs. According to Randy Rook, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Director of Federal Grants Management, Missouri complies with all of the regulatory policy and most of the non-regulatory guidance.

Guidance for the Federal Programs also comes from the Federal Register, which is published by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). The Federal Register is the official daily publication for rules, proposed rules, and notices of federal agencies and organizations. It also includes orders from the President and other presidential documents.

As state education departments review the guidance that the federal government sends out, questions arise and clarification is requested. Those letters are sent to the U. S. Secretary of Education. The response to those inquiries is sent to all the state education departments and becomes another source of guidance.

In summary, implementation guidelines for the checklist come from a variety of sources to form “best practice” for the Consolidated Federal Programs. The checklist thus provides the district with the framework needed to implement programs that meet the standards set for each grant and is the centerpiece used in this program evaluation. The checklist is also used as the evaluation tool for Consolidated Federal Programs in a Missouri School Improvement Process review.

**Methodology**

Data were gathered by review of an evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program implementation, Title I.A/II.A parent phone survey, Title I/II.A program survey, Title I.A adequate yearly progress, Title II.A professional development and special education schools literacy data, Title II.D professional development for technology data, Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 data, Title IV.A Safe & Drug Free Communities parent survey, Title V.A assistive technology training and toolkits data, Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee, public forum, and cost analysis.
Results

The committee members met to review, assimilate, and analyze the program evaluation data. Through discussion and questioning, the committee identified areas of strength and weakness that were noted across multiple data sources.

Strengths

Evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program Implementation

- Programs are being implemented very successfully and with validity. No major discrepancy existed between actual program implementation and desired implementation. Ninety-three percent of the items (62 of 67 items) on the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist were in compliance. All noncompliant items are easily resolved. Actions taken since the documentation review ensure that 2004-2005 documentation is in 100% compliance. The five items scored District Resolved were able to be resolved 2 weeks after the work session.
- Since DESE uses the documentation from the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist to do their MSIP review for Federal Programs, SSD is compliant moving into the MSIP year.

Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Survey

- Parents were very satisfied with the program and the progress their children were making in reading and writing.
- When parents participated in school activities, the activities were rated a very positive experience.
- Parents felt the Title I Newsletter (Appendix 5-2) was very useful and an effective method of communicating parenting and educational issues.
- Parents’ ideas are solicited and acted upon.
- Free transportation to school activities is offered to parents of Title I students.
- Participation in the survey was high.
- Parent involvement policies inform parents of the opportunities available to them for participation in school activities.

Title I/II.A Program Survey

- Administrators and staff strongly agreed that the literacy program was a great benefit to their students.
- Administrators and staff were very satisfied with the implementation of the program in respect to scheduling and collaborative planning.
• Administrators and staff had a very clear understanding of the regulations that guide the program.

**Title I.A Adequate Yearly Progress**
• Students receiving reading and/or writing instruction from the reading specialist continue to make progress.
• Title I.A students are reaching and maintaining expectancy, despite the severity of the disabilities of the students in the special education schools.
• Maintenance of skills is being tracked.
• Title I.A students exit the program based on fall scores, making sure there has not been regression over the summer.
• Students who do not reach expectancy by the end of the year, are still making progress based on Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) scores.
• Progress is being monitored and planning is done for those students who do not reach expectancy.
• Title I cumulative expectancy data in spring 2004 for reading and written language indicated there was almost no achievement gap between black and white students.

**Title II.A Professional Development and Special Education Schools Literacy Data**
• Teachers receive ongoing professional development on how to administer and interpret literacy assessments.
• Students in the special education schools are demonstrating increased literacy skills.
• Literacy skills of all students in grades K-10 in the special education schools are being assessed using a continuum of 5 literacy assessments.

**Title II.D Professional Development for Technology Data**
• Instructional staff are able to integrate acquired skills into daily instructional activities as a result of the professional development they receive.
• Multipart training includes follow up and support through email, phone, and online tutorials provided by the district.
• SSD’s trainings are aligned with partner school district’s technology standards.

**Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 Data**
• All goals were met for 2003-2004.
• Data was used to determine progress and set goals.
• Goals and programming were based on site-based student needs.
• The existing PBS data collection method was used to collect data for goal one, so teachers had less paperwork to complete.
The methods used to keep parents informed about school safety and alcohol
tobacco and other drugs (ATOD) issues were effective, especially newsletters,
workshops, and trainings.

**Title V Assistive Technology (AT) Training and Toolkits**
- Fifteen out of seventeen AT teams reported their students improved in the selected
area of performance as a result of the use of the assistive technology toolkit items.
- Toolkits and multi-session hands-on trainings helped participants develop
competence and skill in use of the toolkit items.
- Toolkit software was used to create activities for students besides the targeted
student.
- AT teams were able to use toolkit items to design or modify activities for their
students.

**Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee**
- The committee included representatives from all schools and federal programs.
- There was productive, proactive involvement and parents were interested in
continued involvement.

**Concerns**
The evaluation identified five main areas of challenge.

**Consolidated Federal Programs Implementation**
The analysis of the evaluation of Consolidated Federal Programs implementation
indicated two minor areas of concern: documentation and parent involvement issues. No
major discrepancy existed between actual program implementation and desired
implementation. The documentation and parent involvement items have been resolved
for 2004-2005, bringing the district into full compliance.

**Parent Participation**
Even though schools have parent involvement policies and provide opportunities
for parents to participate in school activities, parents’ attendance at school activities is low.
Fifty-three percent of parents report talking to or meeting the Title I teacher with which
their child works.

**Special Education Schools Literacy Data**
While remaining high, the percent of students who have made progress in literacy
skills dropped in 2004-2005. Further analysis by the four literacy advisory committees
needs to be done to determine future direction for the literacy instructional programs for students in the special education schools. Professional development activities funded through Title II.A should reflect this analysis. Also, due to the subjectivity of the continuum of literacy assessments, rater reliability may be in question.

**Technology Training**

Due to low registration for technology trainings, eleven out of thirty-one scheduled trainings were cancelled. Fewer people attended the trainings in comparison to previous years. During 2003-2004 school year, 254 staff members attended training compared to only 156 this year. Attendance has fallen off since the change in district guidelines on release time for professional development, the required new teacher training, and the advent of Encore.

**Parent Concerns about Safe and Drug-Free Schools Issues**

One of the weaknesses of the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey was that the survey questions were not clear. Questions need to be revised and be clearly focused on the parents’ concern about ATOD, violence, and bullying issues in school, instead of the community at large. Winter 2005 survey results conflicted with the October 2004 MSIP parent survey results. Also, the return rate for the survey was very small, making interpretation of the results difficult.

**Limitations**

The data collected for this evaluation provided the committee with a significant amount of information that had not previously been reviewed as a whole to lead towards systemic improvement. However, in the process of data analysis, the committee noted several limitations that may have affected the reported results. These limitations should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results and designing future program evaluation activities.

1. Student input was not included.

2. The Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey had some design flaws. It was difficult to tell if parents’ concerns were about problems in the schools or the community at large. Also the return rate was very small.

3. Due to the small numbers when Title I data is disaggregated, one must be cautious when drawing conclusions.
4. The process of how instruction was given was not evaluated for Title II.A: Training and Recruiting Highly Qualified Teachers and Principals.

5. Student outcome data used to evaluate some Title II.D technology professional development was reflected through teacher feedback only.

Recommendations

The recommendations address identified needs concerning the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist implementation; lack of parent participation; Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey; and trainings for literacy instruction, assistive technical teams, and technology. The following recommendations align with the district rolling plan objectives. Action plans will be developed pending approval of the Board.

1. Assure continuity of Consolidated Federal Programs documentation across all schools as defined by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist.

2. Continue to monitor changes in the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist and adjust programming and documentation to assure future compliance.

3. Review/revise parent contact process with Title I staff.

4. Analyze district literacy data and plan future professional development needs based on assessment results’ analysis.

5. Increase attendance at scheduled technology trainings by adjusting training schedule, advertising to targeted populations, and linking trainings to national technology standards and MSIP indicators.

6. Redesign the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey and investigate processes that result in higher return rates. Involve both special education and technical school administrators in the survey revisions.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose

The program evaluation framework approved in 2003 by the Special School District’s Board of Education defines the process used to evaluate the Consolidated Federal Title Programs. The framework guides the district in conducting program evaluation activities to measure, analyze, and effectively manage programs and operations throughout the district. The Program Evaluation for the Consolidated Federal Programs took place from December 2004 to June 2005. The committee membership included a diverse group of teachers, parents, facilitators, and administrators from the special education schools, technical high schools, and partner districts who represented all the Federal Title grants (Appendix 1-1). The questions posed by the advisory committee and approved by the Board of Education were designed to provide a review of Special School District’s implementation of the Federal Programs.

Focus for the Program Evaluation

The focus of the program evaluation was to answer the following questions approved by the Board of Education.

1. What are the discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired implementation as identified by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist?
2. What is the extent of the discrepancies?

Design of the Report

The report documents the review of current guidelines for successful implementation of the Consolidated Federal Programs and the methodology used to evaluate them. The results and discussion of data is based upon the expectations set by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) as outlined in the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist. The limitations of the program evaluation are addressed as well as recommendations of the evaluation team. The
committee has also developed action plans that may serve to guide the implementation of any recommendations that the Board of Education approves.
CHAPTER II

CONSOLIDATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS
HISTORY and DESCRIPTION

The Consolidated Federal Programs are a set of grants funded by the federal government and administered by the state through the Federal Grants Management division of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Each grant has its own unique characteristics, while sharing common features with the other formula/entitlement grants.

Historical Perspective

Congress under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 first authorized what is today known as the Consolidated Federal Title Programs. Public Law 89-10 was Congress’s first major attempt to provide a federal assistance program to the country’s public elementary and secondary schools. ESEA was reauthorized in 2001 under Public Law 107-110 as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Over the 40 years of ESEA and NCLB, the number, names and focus of the various grants have changed to meet the mandates set out by Congress and the shifting political climate (Kaestle, p.26).

The present focus for the Consolidated Federal Programs under NCLB is to help districts close the achievement gap through flexibility and choice, coupled with accountability measures. In 2004-2005 SSD received funding under six out of the nine entitlement or formula grants:

- Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged.
- Title I.D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Delinquent and At-Risk Students.
- Title II.A: Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals.
- Title II.D: Enhancing Education Through Technology.
- Title IV.A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities.
- Title V.A: Innovative Programs.

SSD was not eligible for funding for: Title I.C: Education of Migrant Children, Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students, and Title VI.B: Rural Education Initiative.

Allocations

The Consolidated Federal Programs allocations that are received by a school district are determined by formulas, which take into consideration the census count and
the number of students that receive free or reduced lunch in the district (Appendix 2-1). Due to the unique nature of how students are placed in the Special Education and Technical Schools, the method of determining SSD’s allocation looks somewhat different than that of the partner districts. Special School District turns into DESE the number of free and reduced lunch students in each one of the technical and special education schools, along with the school district from which those students come. DESE calculates the percent of SSD students who come from each partner district, and then gives SSD that percent of the partner district’s allocation. As an example, if the number of students who come from Affton and who are in the special education schools and technical schools is 1% of Affton’s student population, SSD would receive 1% of Affton’s allocations. Over the last 7 years SSD’s total Consolidated Federal Programs allocation has dropped more than $220,000.

Writing the Grants

Usually in late April or the beginning of May, DESE sends SSD’s next year’s estimated allocation for each grant. The grants need to be written, approved by the Board of Education, and submitted to DESE for approval by June 30, so funds can be expended starting July 1. No expenditures can be made until DESE has approved the application. The Federal Programs Coordinator uses the priorities established by the committees evaluating the grant activities to complete the electronic application. There are major challenges to completing the application. It is not unusual for allocations to change without notification. The changing allocations make it difficult to calculate the teaching positions the grants will support. Also, the web application often has glitches in it where information that has been entered is wiped out. Another challenge is that indirect costs have to be planned for at the beginning of the year without knowing what the actual rate will be for the year. Indirect costs are money that the district takes off the top of the grants to pay for heat, light, etc. The federal government does not establish an indirect cost rate until the end of the school year. The rate for 2004-2005 was not set until April 25, 2005. Completing the application by the June 30 deadline is very difficult.

The Title I grant is the most difficult and complex grant to write. For purposes of discussion Title I includes Title I.A and Title I.D. The guiding focus for spending Title I funds is to provide as much reading specialist support as possible in the delinquent sites and schools that qualify as targeted assistance programs; those that have 35% or higher free and reduced lunch population. Ackerman, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, Northview, and Page Bridges have targeted assistance programs in 2004-2005 funded by Title I.A. These are the same sites that qualified in past years. Lakeside Center and the Juvenile Detention Center qualify by virtue of the fact that they are delinquent institutions and are funded by Title I.D funds.
The number of free and reduced lunch students in their building determines the amount of reading specialist support a site receives. To determine the funding by site, set asides (money taken off the top of the grant to cover mandated expenditures) are calculated for program administration (8%), parent involvement (at least 10%), delinquent funds, professional development, and salary differential. The salary differential set aside protects sites from being penalized for having a high-dollar teacher. Also indirect costs, which vary from year to year, are taken out of the available funds. After set asides and indirect costs are subtracted from the Title I allocation, the remaining money is divided by the total number of free and reduced students that were reported in January to get a per pupil amount. The site allocation is calculated by multiplying the per pupil amount by the number of free and reduced students at that site. Based on the site allocation, the amount of reading specialist support is determined. Any money remaining after salaries and benefits for the teacher are deducted, is budgeted by the Title I teacher and the building administrator.

Over the last several years, funds have been flexed from the other grants into Title I to maintain the level of reading specialist support. Due to decreased funding in 2004-2005 a .6 FTE position was cut from Title I. The literacy coach position at Southview funded through Title II.A in FY04 and by Title V.A in FY05, was cut by .4 FTE.

For Titles II.A, II.D, IV.A, and V.A funds are budgeted based on the priorities established by the committees evaluating the grant activities. Program administration and indirect costs are taken out of each grant allocation and the remaining funds are distributed according to the identified need.

Legislative Purpose

Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged

SSD’s largest grant is Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged. Funding is used to provide supplemental reading instruction to eligible students. The legislative purpose of Title I as stated on page 20 of the Consolidated Federal Programs Administrative Manual published in January of 2005 is as follows.

Title I was enacted to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and assessments. This can be accomplished by meeting the educational needs of low-achieving children, closing the achievement gap between high- and low-performing children, high standards for all students, enriched and accelerated instruction, decentralized decision making, improved accountability, high quality
professional development, coordination and integration of services, expanded family involvement, extended learning time, and early intervention.

Title I.D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Delinquent and At-Risk Students

The allocation for Title I.D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Delinquent and At-Risk Students is included with the allocation for Title I.A. Each spring SSD works with the administration of Lakeside Center and the Juvenile Detention Center to craft Delinquent Institution Program Plans for the coming year (Appendix 2-2 and 2-3). The bulk of the funding for Title I.D is used to provide supplemental reading instruction to students at Lakeside Center and the Juvenile Detention Center by funding reading specialists at each site.

Title II.A: Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals

The legislative purpose for Title II.A: Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals is to increase student achievement through high quality professional development for teachers and principals to increase the quality of instruction and leadership. Funds may also be used to increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals. The activities that SSD funds through Title II.A include four literacy advisory groups that determine the professional development needs of the teachers in the elementary and secondary special education schools, book study groups, literacy presenters, and literacy workshops. All activities funded by Title II.A are based on input from the advisory groups, analysis of state and district literacy data, and a needs assessment of the staff. All professional development activities meet the high quality professional development criteria set by the state and NCLB.

Title II.D: Enhancing Education Through Technology

SSD receives funds for technology under Title II.D: Enhancing Education through Technology. The legislative “purpose of the Title II.D is to improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools while assisting every student in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade. It must also provide research-based professional development resulting in effective integration of technology resources with classroom instruction,” (Administrative Manual, p. 58). At least twenty-five percent of II.D funds must be used for professional development that addresses the use of technology in instruction to meet Federal guidelines. The remainder of the funds can be used for a variety of technology related activities such as the purchase of technology to enable teachers to increase student academic achievement. DESE provides a list of allowable uses. SSD uses 100% of its Title
II D funds for training staff in computer operating systems, visual graphing software, the FirstClass email system, and multimedia classroom projects to assist teachers in integrating technology into the classroom and meeting the needs of their students.

Title IV.A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

The legislative purpose of Title IV.A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities “is to support programs that prevent violence in and around schools and the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs; to involve parents and communities in the selection of activities and evaluation of their effectiveness; and to coordinate activities with related Federal, State, school, and community efforts and resources to foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports student academic achievement.” (Administrative Manual, p. 69) All activities must comply with the Principles of Effectiveness (Appendix 2-4), a set of 6 guidelines that follow the school improvement process of looking at objective data and analyzing it to establish need, set goals, and develop activities. Data is collected during activity implementation, and then is analyzed to determine effectiveness. The process is then repeated. In addition, the principles of effectiveness require parent and community participation in the process and must be based on scientifically based research proven to reduce violence and illegal drug use. Program outcomes are to be reported to the community on a yearly basis. SSD uses Title IV.A funds to support activities to decrease students’ physical and verbal aggression and increase pro-social behavior in the special education schools and to increase students’ knowledge of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs in the court programs and technical schools.

Title V.A: Innovative Programs

Title V.A: Innovative Programs is somewhat of a catchall grant and has the broadest range of purposes and uses. The Federal Programs Administrative Manual on page 75 lists 5 legislative purposes:

- To support local education reform efforts consistent with and supportive of statewide education reform efforts
- To provide funding to implement promising educational reform programs and school improvement programs based on scientifically based research
- To meet the educational needs of all students, including at-risk youth
- To develop and implement education programs to improve school, student, and teacher performance, including professional development activities and class size reduction.
- To provide a continuing source of innovation and educational improvement, including support for library services and instructional media materials

The manual lists 24 allowable uses encompassing a vast array of programs such as preschool programs, hiring school nurses, technology acquisition, school safety programs,
implementing research-based academic programs, technology professional development, just to name a few. In 2003-2004 Title V.A money was used to pay for assistive technology toolkits for assistive technology tech team members. During the 2004-2005 school year, SSD used Title V.A monies to provide a part-time literacy coach at Southview, assistive technology toolkits for assistive technology tech team members, and student reinforcers for the Positive Behavior Support program at Litzsinger and Bridges. Activities are determined through the school improvement process and are based on data from the assistive technical teams, district literacy data from Southview, and Positive Behavior Support data from Litzsinger and Bridges.

For a complete list of allowable uses for the entitlement grants, see Appendix 2-5.
CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist (CFPSMC) (Appendix 3-1) is the central document used to determine proper implementation of the Consolidated Federal Programs. The grants Special School District receives funding for are: Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged, Title I.D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Delinquent and At-Risk Students, Title II.A: Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals, Title II.D: Enhancing Education Through Technology, Title IV.A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and Title V.A: Innovative Programs. The checklist guides implementation of the grants and defines “best practice.” The guidance that drives the CFPSMC comes from the following sources: No Child Left Behind law (NCLB), state statutes, guidance from the Federal Government in the form of regulatory and non-regulatory policy guidance, regulations that are part of the Federal Register, and Secretary of State letters in response to issues and questions that have arisen from the states.

When ESEA was reauthorized in 2001 under NCLB, many changes occurred in how the grants were implemented. The major focus became closing the achievement gap and resulted in changes in accountability, flexibility, and choice that are reflected in the checklist. Accountability is documented through the school improvement process that is used to drive goals and activities. Schools are held accountable for collecting data, analyzing it to determine strengths/weaknesses/progress, and then making necessary changes based on the analysis. The process is repeated each school year. All the entitlement grants use this process to determine programming and spending.

The NCLB law provides the overall framework for the CFPSMC. NCLB allows flexibility of funds between certain grants. Up to 50% of funds can be transferred out of or into Title II.A, II.D, IV.A, and V.A. Title I can receive funds from any of those titles. This allows districts the opportunity to target areas of greatest need and concern. If a school has been identified for Title I School Improvement, they may transfer only 30% of their funds. If the school is in corrective action, they may not transfer any funds. SSD does take advantage of transfer flexibility and choice to provide additional support for literacy through Titles I and V.A.

Another source of the guidance that DESE uses to develop the checklist is state statutes. All guidance must comply with state law, as well as with the tenants of NCLB.

Three additional sources of guidance that drive the checklist documentation come from the Federal Government: regulatory and non-regulatory policy guidance,
regulations that are part of the Federal Register, and Secretary of Education letters in response to issues and questions that have arisen from the states.

Regulatory policy guidance is the federal statutes and all the regulations that go with them. The state must comply with all of the federal laws. Non-regulatory policy is policy that is suggested by the Department of Education, but does not have to be followed by the states. Non-regulatory policy guidance deals mainly with best practice and effective programs. According to Randy Rook, the DESE Director of Federal Grants Management, Missouri complies with all of the regulatory policy and most of the non-regulatory guidance.

Guidance for the Federal Programs also comes from the Federal Register, which is published by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). The Federal Register is the official daily publication for rules, proposed rules, and notices of federal agencies and organizations. It also includes orders from the President and other presidential documents.

As state education departments review the guidance that the federal government sends out, questions arise and clarification is requested. Those letters are sent to the U. S. Secretary of Education. The response to those inquiries is sent to all the state education departments and becomes another source of guidance.

In summary, implementation guidelines for the checklist come from a variety of sources to form “best practice” for the Consolidated Federal Programs. The checklist thus provides the district with the framework needed to implement programs that meet the standards set for each grant and is the centerpiece used in this program evaluation. The checklist is also used as the evaluation tool for Consolidated Federal Programs in a Missouri School Improvement Process (MSIP) review.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The focus of this chapter includes the procedures utilized in the program evaluation process and methods of data collection and analysis used in the program evaluation for Federal Programs.

Process

The program evaluation process involved various stakeholders including parents, teachers, administrators, and community members. A committee was established to work collaboratively on the program evaluation tasks. The committee membership included a director, grant accountant, and a diverse group of teachers, parents, facilitators, and administrators from the special education schools, technical high schools, and partner districts who represented all the Federal Title grants. The larger committee met in December, January, February, and April. The smaller committee met in February and March to develop the consensus process used by the larger group and to analyze and interpret the results.

Additional parent and community input was solicited through a public forum that was held in April.

Methods for Data Collection and Analysis

Twelve methods were used to collect data:

- Evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program implementation
- Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Survey
- Title I.A/II.A Program Survey
- Title I adequate yearly progress
- Title II.A professional development and special education schools literacy data
- Title II.D professional development for technology data
- Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 data
- Title IV.A Safe & Drug Free Communities Parent Survey
- Title V.A assistive technology training and toolkits
- Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee
- Public forum
- Cost analysis
The evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program implementation was used to answer the two guiding questions (What are the discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired implementation as identified by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist? and What is the extent of the discrepancies?). The Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Survey, Title I.A/II.A Program Survey, Title IV.A Safe & Drug Free Communities Parent Survey, Title V.A assistive technology training and toolkits data, and Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee data revealed parents and staff perceptions about the implementation and success of Titles I, IID, IV.A, and V.A. Student outcome data from Title I.A and the special education schools’ literacy testing provided a measure of successful implementation of Titles I.A and II.A.

Evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program Implementation

The purpose of the program evaluation was to determine the discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired program implementation as identified by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist. For the committee to be able to determine the discrepancies, they first needed to understand the checklist. In January the larger committee received training from Randy Rook, Director of Federal Grants management for DESE, on the checklist and what documentation was required to demonstrate compliance.

In February the group who had received the training reconvened to look at the documentation for the 2003-2004 checklist. 2003-2004 was used because the year’s activities were completed and documented. 2004-2005 activities are still occurring and documentation is still being compiled. It should be noted that the items on the two checklists are identical. As is done every year, the items on the checklist are copied, cut, and pasted on file folders. Each file folder contains one entry on the checklist. The required documentation is then put into the folder throughout the year to verify that we have met the state standard. When the committee met, the checklist file folders for 2003-2004 were used to determine discrepancies between actual and desired program implementation. All teacher, student, and staff names were removed from the documentation to maintain confidentiality.

The evaluation process used that day was a group consensus process. The Work Group was divided into 2 smaller groups, Group 1 and 2. Group 1 looked at General Provisions folders #1-5 and Title I.A. The facilitator and recorder for that group was Sheri Menscher. Group 2 looked at General Provisions folders #6-8, Title II.A, Title II.D, Title IV.A, and Title V.A. The facilitator and recorder for that group was Dr. Chialin Hsieh. Group participants were assigned to groups based on where they could provide an unbiased, objective evaluation.

Each person had a copy of the Self-Monitoring Checklist. The session began with an overview of the consensus process. To provide guided practice and to ensure the
consensus process was understood, each person in the group was given the same folder and independently rated the documentation from that folder using the following codes: DC - District Compliant, DR – District Resolving, DA - District Assistance, or NA - Not Applicable. Some items included checkboxes. If a code other than DC was used, raters were instructed to note why/what the problem was, and list possible ways to bring the folder into compliance. After everyone had an opportunity to record their code on the rating sheet, the two facilitators worked with their respective groups to come to a consensus rating and mark that rating on the group sheets. The facilitator’s function was to facilitate the group consensus process, not to give an opinion. They also were the official recorder for the group. They recorded the rating and any comments or recommendations the group made.

Once the first folder was completed and the evaluation process was understood, the group worked with 5 or 6 folders at a time. Each person in the group rated a different folder. Once they had rated the folder and recorded it on their sheet, the folder was passed to another member of the group. The folders were rotated among the group members until everyone had rated each folder. Then the facilitators began the consensus process, working through each folder. Group members were asked to initial the bottom of the official recording sheet, to indicate that they agreed with the group’s decision. The remainder of the folders was rated using the same process.

In March the smaller advisory committee met to compare the committee’s consensus results with a similar analysis that had been done by the Federal Programs Coordinator. The facilitators brought their group sheets. The checklist file folders used in the consensus process, along with the original documentation that included student and staff names, were used in the meeting for reference when questions arose. The group worked item-by-item, comparing the two checklist recording sheets. DC: District Compliant, was the standard that indicated there were no discrepancies between actual and desired program implementation. Using a spreadsheet, the group results and Federal Programs Coordinator’s results were recorded. When there was a discrepancy between the two summary sheets, the documentation was reviewed along with the comments from the group rating sheets. A decision was then made on the correct code to be entered for the item. That information was recorded in a separate column on the spreadsheet and used to determine the percent of discrepancy. The percent of discrepancy was determined by comparing the number of items marked DC to the total possible that could be marked DC. For any item that was not marked DC, a recommendation for action to resolve the discrepancy was determined.

**Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Survey**

Parents/guardians of students who received Title I.A/II.A services were contacted by phone to get feedback on the activities and effectiveness of Title I.A/II.A program
The survey was designed by the Title I staff. The Federal Programs secretary made the contacts. She followed a script and recorded the parents’ responses on a response sheet. A minimum of three attempts was made to reach parents.

**Title I/II.A Program Survey**

Feedback was gathered from teachers and administrators concerning the effectiveness of the Title I/II.A reading program in their buildings (Appendix 4-2). The survey was sent to both administrators at the schools that have Title I and II.A programs: Ackerman, Northview, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, Bridges, JDC, Lakeside, and Southview. Surveys were also sent to the Title I/II.A staff and the teachers that have students who receive Title I services.

**Title I.A Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Alternate Data**

Adequate Yearly Progress as defined by DESE and NCLB “measures the percent of students who are proficient in communication arts and math on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). Building and subgroups with the appropriate cell size must make the annual goal in order to make AYP.” (Administrative Manual, pp 41) Appropriate cell/sample size is defined as a group of at least 30 students for AYP to be determined. For subgroups such as students with IEP’s, race, gender, and social economic status, the cell size must be at least 50. Each year DESE determines the percent of students in a building that must score in the “proficient” or “advanced” category on the MAP in reading and math. All subgroups must make AYP in reading and math for a building to make AYP. In 2004-2005 38.8% of students in communications arts and 31.1% in mathematics must score “proficient” or “advanced” (Appendix 4-3).

If a building receives Title I funds and does not make AYP for two consecutive years in a row in communication arts or math, the school will be placed in school improvement. District MAP results are reviewed as well, to determine the district’s progress meeting AYP. A district found not making progress is placed in school improvement and must revise their Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) to assist students who are performing poorly to become proficient. Corrective action is the next step if a building or district does not make AYP the third consecutive year following identification. Special regulations apply to buildings and districts in school improvement and corrective action. Due to the low number of students that take the MAP at any given grade level in the special education schools, DESE has not been able to determined AYP and no SSD schools are in school improvement.

Since the MAP assessment does not provide a good measure on which to determine progress for students or the program in our special education schools, the Title I.A program uses an alternate measure to determine success. At the beginning and end of the school year, students are given the reading and written language subtests of the
Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Revised. The scores at the beginning of the year are one of several measures used to determine eligibility for Title I services. The standard scores on Broad Reading and Broad Written Language are compared to the child’s IQ to determine if the child is reading and writing at a level commensurate to his/her ability. If the standard score falls below the expected range for the IQ, and the child meets the other eligibility requirements, s/he receives Title I.A services during the school year in reading and/or written language. At the end of the year the Woodcock Johnson is repeated. A comparison is made between beginning-of-year and end-of-year scores for both areas to measure program success. Also, individual student data is reviewed by the Federal Programs Coordinator, building supervisor, and Title I reading specialist to identify appropriate instructional placement and strategies for the coming year. All students who are reading and writing at expectancy at the end of the year are retested in the fall to check maintenance and determine if they are ready to exit the Title I.A. program.

Title II.A Professional Development and Special Education Schools’ Literacy Data

Title II.A funding is used to provide professional development in the area of literacy for teachers in the special education schools. Literacy is an instructional focus area for the special education schools as defined in the Regional CSIP goals. All activities funded by Title II.A are based on input from teachers through the literacy advisory groups, analysis of MAP and alternative literacy data, and a needs assessment of the staff. Title II.A funds supported a variety of professional development activities in 2004-2005 in the area of literacy. The activities were determined by four literacy advisory groups made up of teachers and administrators from the special education schools: Elementary MAP, Elementary MAP-A, Secondary MAP, and Secondary MAP-A. The literacy advisory groups also: developed literacy assessments, analyzed assessment results, provided a voice for teachers, and discussed issues related to literacy for their respective student populations. One outcome of the Elementary MAP-A committee was the development of a folder on First Class for teachers to share adaptations and modifications to the general education curriculum. New elementary teachers and paraprofessionals in the special education schools received an overview of the Four Block literacy program. New elementary and secondary teachers were trained to do running records to inform their daily instruction, and to give the continuum of literacy assessments. The elementary teachers who work with students who take the MAP participated in a two-part training on how to determine the focus for instruction using assessments. Elementary teachers, speech and language pathologist’s (SLP), and Occupational Therapist’s/Physical Therapist’s (OT/PT) who work with students who take the MAP-A, participated in a day-long Make-It, Take-It training on adapting books for reading instruction and making electronic storybooks. Secondary teachers who work
with MAP students received training in how to interpret and use Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) and Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) assessments to inform their instruction. Book studies on Ruby Payne’s book, *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*, were done by the staff at JDC, Lakeside, and Ackerman. Ackerman’s study group also included parents. Title II.A funds paid for the books. All teachers in the special education schools received an Instructional Strategies & Curriculum Resource Guide developed by a group of teachers from the Elementary MAP Literacy Advisory Committee funded by Title II.A. The guide was developed as a resource to help teachers determine what instructional strategies and activities to use when a student was having a problem in reading or writing. Title II.A funds also supported eight teachers and five administrators to attend the Literacy Leaders Institute. The professional development activities funded by Title II.A were varied and met the needs of the teachers in the special education schools who work with a diverse student population.

The success of professional development for teachers is measured by looking at student performance outcomes of their students. MAP and MAP-A results are used to look at student success, but do not provide the best measure of assessing student progress for students in the special education schools. For this reason, alternative literacy data is used. The alternative literacy data used to access students’ progress, and ultimately the success of the professional development, is a continuum of five literacy assessments: Story Observation Checklist (SOC), Checklist of Emergent Literacy Skills (COELS), Beginning Reading Test (BRT), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), and the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) (Appendix 4-4). The Elementary MAP-A Literacy Advisory Committee developed the SOC and COELS because there were few tools available to measure literacy progress of students with the most severe cognitive and physical disabilities. The committee adapted work by Carolyn Musslewhite and Patti King-DeBaun. The BRT developed by Marie Clay, the founder of the Reading Recovery Program, is an assessment given to students who are just beginning to read and is made up of 7 short tests that measure emergent literacy skills (letter identification, concepts of print, writing vocabulary, dictation, word recognition, phonemic segmentation and blending, and writing sample). The DRA and QRI are informal reading inventories that determine an instructional reading level. The DRA measures reading levels up to grade 5; the QRI is used for grades 6, upper middle school, and high school.

In 2002-2003 the decision was made to start assessing the elementary students in grades K-8 who take the MAP using the BRT, DRA, and QRI. In the same year the assessments for the students who take the MAP-A were developed and piloted. The plan was to add a grade level each year until all students K-12 are being assessed for progress in literacy. In 2003-2004 the MAP-A assessments were refined and grades K-9 were assessed. In 2004-2005 the assessments became a continuum and grade 10 students were added.
The assessments are given in the fall and spring each year. Students are given the assessment corresponding to their literacy skills. As students increase their skills, the next level of assessment is given. Students demonstrate progress in one or more ways: increasing their score on an assessment and/or moving to a higher-level assessment.

**Title II.D Professional Development for Technology Training**

Title II.D funds were utilized to provide thirty-one high quality professional development opportunities that address the use of technology in instruction during the 2004-2005 school year. Instructional Technology Specialists provided additional trainings that are not funded by the grant. SSD used International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards and National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) in coordination with the District’s Technology Plan and software committee recommendations to determine types of trainings offered. All trainings met the High Quality Professional Development guidelines established by the No Child Left Behind legislation and the state (Appendix 4-5). Data was collected through feedback from Professional Development Activity Evaluation Forms completed by every staff member attending a professional development activity. Also, participants in project-based, multi-part trainings completed projects to demonstrate integration of application software into instruction. Trainings are made available annually via the Professional Development Resource Guide.

These training opportunities occurred in the 2004-05 school year:

**First Class for SSD -**

*Types of Activities:* This one part training provides hands-on experience and support materials for staff to access SSD’s First Class email system. Teachers are actively engaged over time by submitting email to the trainer on a periodic basis and by communicating with their supervisor via SSD’s First Class system. Teachers learn to create, send, and read email. Other aspects of the system (chat, conferences, downloading attachments, using the directory, etc.) are covered. An overview of how this training meets the standards for high quality staff development is presented.

*Expected Student Outcome:* Staff utilize the First Class system to fulfill district obligations for student needs.

*Expected Participant Outcome:* Participants are able to communicate effectively with supervisors and other staff as required.

*Participant Requirements for Completion:* Staff send email to the presenter to demonstrate their use of FC outside of the workshop.

*Follow-up Supports and Activities to Extend Learning:* Teachers communicate with the presenter and other class participants via SSD First Class email. Teachers receive support materials.
Using Inspiration / Kidspiration Software -

*Types of Activities:* Instructional staff learn to use Inspiration or Kidspiration software (Windows and Macintosh platforms). Staff get a licensed copy of one of these titles based on student need. This two-part hands-on workshop expose teachers to the fundamentals of this organizational tool and provide follow up activities to incorporate in the classroom. An overview of how this training meets the standards for high quality staff development is presented.

*Expected Student Outcome:* Increase student awareness and/or use of graphic organizers. This software closely aligns with skills assessed by MAP (SSD Technology Plan 2004-2006).

*Expected Participant Outcome:* Participants are able to utilize technology to assist students in the educational environment.

*Participant Requirements for Completion:* Participants attend both sessions. Teachers create and integrate learning activities to support student outcomes and share these activities with the class.

*Follow-up Supports and Activities to Extend Learning:* Teachers communicate with the presenter and other class participants via SSD First Class email. Teachers receive a copy of “Achieving Standards with Inspiration 7” or “Kidspiration Activity Book” as support materials.

Multimedia Tools for Mac OS X -

*Types of Activities:* Teachers learn to create multimedia projects for the classroom using Macintosh OSX. Teachers gain skills to combine music and photos to create digital movies with the iLife suite of software. Teachers take digital photos and video, import them into the computer, and edit them. An overview of how this training meets the standards for high quality staff development is presented.

*Expected Student Outcome:* Students use iLife software to create curriculum-based presentations. MO Show Me Standards - Goal 2 - 1. plan and make written, oral and visual presentations for a variety of purposes and audiences, and; 7. use technological tools to exchange information and ideas (SSD Technology Plan 2004-2006).

*Expected Participant Outcome:* Teachers are able to teach and assist students in the creation of multimedia projects and other reports using technology.

*Participant Requirements for Completion:* Participants provide documentation of student outcomes per the instructor's direction. Participants attend all three sessions. Teachers create and integrate learning activities to support student outcomes and share these activities with the class.

*Follow-up Supports and Activities to Extend Learning:* Teachers communicate with the presenter and other class participants via SSD First Class email. Teachers receive support materials, software, and hardware required for the class.
Introduction to OSX-

*Types of Activities:* Staff learn skills for using Mac OS X and about the many possibilities for its use in the classroom. Staff learn to navigate, open files and folders, and use the multiple user interface. Staff receive instruction on using accessibility features as well as an overview of Apple’s Digital Hub. Staff also gain many of the skills required for Level One Contract Test-Out for Apple computers running Mac OS X. An overview of how this training meets the standards for high quality staff development is presented.

*Expected Student Outcome:* Students benefit from enhanced accessibility and ease-of-use features. Students learn from the teacher how to do basic projects using Mac OS X. Student use of technology for research, learning, and enrichment increases as teachers become more informed and proficient users, appropriate models and integrators of technology. Students use technological tools and other resources to locate, select, and organize information (SSD Technology Plan 2004-2006).

*Expected Participant Outcome:* Participants are able to setup and control accessibility and ease-of-use features in Mac OS X. Teachers are able to instruct students in basic use of OS X, as well as assisting students with projects.

*Participant Requirements for Completion:* Participants provide documentation of student outcomes per the instructors direction. Participants attend both sessions. Teachers create and integrate learning activities to support student outcomes and share these activities with the class.

*Follow-up Supports and Activities to Extend Learning:* Teachers communicate with the presenter and other class participants via SSD First Class email. Teachers receive support materials in class including a CD Rom with additional tutorials.

The End Product-

*Types of Activities:* This hands-on workshop exposes teachers to a variety of techniques and methods of creating classroom projects/materials for every curriculum. Teachers use the internet, provided software (Print Explosion or Print Artist), and other software already available in this training. An emphasis is placed on creative solutions for staff and students. An overview of how this training meets the standards for high quality staff development is presented.

*Expected Student Outcome:* Students use provided software to create curriculum-based presentations and educational materials. The following standards are referenced: MO Show Me Standards - Goal 2 - 1 (Plan and make written, oral, and visual presentations for a variety of purposes and audiences, and use technological tools to exchange information and ideas) and SSD Technology Plan Goal 2, Action Plan Objective 2.1.1 (Students use technological tools and other resources to locate, select, and organize information).
**Expected Participant Outcome:** Participants create instructional materials to enhance student learning.

**Participant Requirements for Completion:** Teachers create and integrate learning activities to support student outcomes and share these activities with the class. Participants send artifacts created to support student outcomes to the presenter.

**Follow-up Supports and Activities to Extend Learning:** Teachers communicate with the presenter and other class participants via SSD First Class email. Teachers receive support materials including a customized CD with all resources and required software.

**Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 Data**

Title IV.A goals and activities for the special education schools and technical schools were developed with input from parents and the special education schools through their representatives on the Title IV.A Advisory Committee. The committee has two representatives from each building plus representatives from several community groups (National Council on Alcohol, Drugs, and Drug Abuse, American Lung Association, Lakeside Victory Program, and a School Resource Officer). Parent input comes from the Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee and the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey that is done each year.

In the spring of 2003 the Title IV.A Advisory Committee developed a tool and surveyed parents, students, and staff from the technical and special education schools to better determine the needs of our student population. The staff of each school analyzed their data and determined three areas of concern, and corresponding activities that they would implement to address the concerns. Title IV.A Advisory Committee members brought the results from their buildings to the spring evaluation meeting. A consensus building activity conducted by the advisory committee resulted in the development of three measurable goals. The goals of the program for 2003-2004 were: to decrease by 3% the incidence of physical and verbal aggression towards staff and students in the special education schools; to increase by 3% acceptable social behavior of students in the special education schools; and to increase by 10% students’ knowledge of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD) for students in the technical high schools and court programs.

Throughout the school year activities were implemented and outcome data was collected. The results were sent into the Federal Programs Coordinator’s office where it was collated. In addition to the data on the activities being implemented, the Federal Programs Coordinator held meetings with parent groups and School Resource Officers to gain their perspective on school safety and ATOD issues. Additional data sources were the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Survey sent home to all parents of students in the special education schools and technical schools and core data information on ATOD, violence, and suspension incidence rates for the special education schools and technical
schools. All data was presented to the Title IV.A Advisory Committee at the spring 2004 evaluation meeting where progress on goals was determined and new goals and activities were set for 2004-2005. In accordance with the Principles of Effectiveness, SSD’s progress towards reducing violence and illegal drug use in schools was made available to the public in the fall 2004 *Special Edition* and on the SSD web site.

Other parent activities are supported by Title IV.A funds. To keep parents informed, a Title IV.A Safe and Drug Free Newsletter that highlights current ATOD and school safety information is sent to parents of students in the special education schools and technical schools twice during the year. In 2004-2005 a Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee was established to give parents an additional opportunity to give their perspective on issues concerning all the Consolidated Federal Programs.

Title IV.A activities continue to focus on reducing physical and verbal aggression, increasing ATOD knowledge, and increasing acceptable social behavior. The technical schools and court programs added an additional goal of decreasing the use of and/or desire to use alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD). It was also recommended that the Title IV.A Safe and Drug Free Newsletter continue to be sent to parents of students in the special education schools and technical schools twice a year and a parent survey be done mid-year.

**Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey**

In March of 2004 and January of 2005 all parents of students in the technical high schools and special education schools were sent a Title IV.A Safe & Drug Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey with their child’s Report Card/Progress Report (Appendix 4-6). The survey addressed parents concerns about alcohol, tobacco, illegal drugs, violence, bullying, verbal abuse, and physical fights. Parents were surveyed on how effective SSD’s efforts have been in substance abuse education, peaceful problem solving, parent education, anger management education, and handling bullying. In addition parents were asked the effectiveness of SSD’s methods of informing them about our programs and activities to keeping children safe and drug-free. Parents also had the opportunity to sign-up to participate in a Federal Programs Parent Advisory Group. Surveys were either returned to the school or mailed directly to the Federal Programs Coordinator.

**Title V.A Assistive Technology Training - Toolkits**

Title V.A funds have provided supplemental support for Assistive Technology (AT) Team Training since 1998. There were two main objectives of AT training. The first objective, Assistive Technology Team Training provides staff progression of skills over 3 years, was not covered by Title V.A funds. During AT training, multi-disciplinary teams attended workshops on topics that support the use of assistive technology to improve student performance. Teams identified the expected change in student performance and
software that matched their student’s instructional need. Teams completed activities to demonstrate their ability to use their skills, observe and measure changes in student performance, and implement assistive technology tools.

Title V.A funds supported the second objective which was to provide toolkit items to team members. Toolkits items were purchased with Title V.A funds. Teams received toolkit items that were used to adapt and modify curriculum (software and portable hard drives). Teams attended 3 days of training.

Teams were asked to report the results of using toolkit items with their students in the following ways:

- Demonstrating an activity created and implemented using the software acquired through training.
- Report quantitative and qualitative data (baseline and then with the AT tool), the expected change in performance related to the A.T. that was implemented, and the data method used to provide evidence of any change in performance.
- Results of student use of the activity.

Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee

Based on responses to the 2003-2004 Title I Parent Phone Survey and the 2003-2004 Title IV.A Safe & Drug Free Communities Parent Survey, a committee was formed to give feedback and input on the work and activities of the Title programs. The first meeting was scheduled for November 2005. Phone calls were made to all people who expressed an interest in being on the committee, letting them know the date, time and place of the meeting. Free transportation was offered. If a person agreed to be on the committee, a follow up letter was sent. Several days prior to the meeting, reminder phone calls were made. Six people indicated they would be at the meeting, but no one attended. A letter that included the agenda, handouts, and the next two meeting dates was sent to all who expressed interest. Additional committee members were added to the member list as results from the 2004-2005 survey came in. Reminder letters and phone calls were made prior to the second meeting. The second meeting was held January 27, 2005 and 8 people attended. All the special education schools and technical schools, with the exception of Page Bridges, had parent representation. Agendas, handouts, meeting notes, and the date of the next meeting were sent to those people who did not attend the second meeting, but expressed interest. A third meeting was scheduled for May 19 when year-end data from all the grants will be reviewed. Participants will have the opportunity to give input on goals for 2005-2006. Also the format of the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey will be reviewed for possible revision.
Public Forum

A public forum was held to gather input from parents, partner district personnel, staff, and community members on Federal Programs. Parents/guardians of Title I students were notified about the forum in a flier sent home by the reading specialists. Fliers were posted in the special education schools, technical high schools, and Central Office. Notification of the forum was also posted on the district website and FirstClass, as well as being sent to members of the four Elementary and Secondary Literacy Advisory Committees, and members of the Federal Programs Program Evaluation Committee. Literacy Advisory members were asked to make copies of the flier and give it to teachers in their buildings. A broadcast message announcing the public forum was sent via the voicemail system to all SSD staff. Notification was also sent to the partner districts via an email to participants of the Title IV.A Networking list serve.

The forum was held from 6:30-7:30 p.m. in the Special School District Central Office on April 7, 2005. A handout of the legislative purpose and allowable uses of each grant as defined by DESE was to be disseminated to participants. Individual posters displayed around the room listed a question for each grant. The questions dealt either with areas of concern that had surfaced during the program evaluation or future uses of the grant funds. Committee members were available for questions or comments. Participants were to write their comments on sticky notes and place them on the posters. There was also a general comment poster for participants who had additional comments.

No one attended the public forum, so there were no comments to review.

Cost Analysis

Cost analysis for Consolidated Federal Programs will focus on three areas: a historical perspective of the funding from DESE over the last seven years, the process for determining allocation use, and spending breakdown over the last two years.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Twelve sets of findings are presented in this chapter. These analyses have been included to answer the following questions approved by the Board of Education and designed to provide a review of Special School District’s implementation of the Consolidated Federal Programs.

1. What are the discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired implementation as identified by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist?
2. What is the extent of the discrepancies?

The sets of findings are listed below.

1. Analysis of the evaluation of Consolidated Federal Programs implementation
2. Results of Title I.A/II.A parent phone survey and analysis of comments
3. Results of the teacher and administrator surveys of the Title I.A/II.A programs
4. Analysis of the Title I.A AYP and alternate data
5. Analysis of Title II.A special education schools literacy data
6. Analysis of Title II.D Professional Development for Technology data
7. Results of the Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 data
8. Results of Title IV.A Safe & Drug Free Communities parent survey
9. Results of Title V.A assistive technology training and toolkits
10. Analysis of the information from the Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee
11. Results of the public forum
12. Cost analysis
Evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program Implementation

Question 1: What are the discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired implementation as identified by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist?

The results of the consensus evaluation activity completed on the documentation folders for the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist revealed that there were 5 minor discrepancies between actual program implementation and desired program implementation. The discrepancies are as follows:

1. The Technical School Parent/Student Handbooks were not included as an evidence source for disseminating a copy of the complaint procedure for Federal Programs. Upon further investigation the technical schools’ handbooks did not include a copy of the complaint procedure.

2. There was not consistent documentation across all Title I schools that coordination occurs between Title I staff and classroom staff. The yearly plans did not reflect coordination with the classroom teacher. Collaboration notes for one reading specialist did not name the classroom teacher or list the date and time of planning session.

3. There was no sample letter of parents being notified when a teacher who is not highly qualified has taught their child four or more consecutive weeks.

4. A list of parent involvement activities that would show evidence of parent involvement activities being conducted consistent with the district parent involvement policy was missing.

5. One Special Education School’s building-level Parent Involvement Plan was missing strategies for increasing opportunities for parent involvement.

Question 2: What is the extent of the discrepancies?

Very little discrepancy existed between actual program implementation and desired implementation. Ninety-three percent of the items on the checklist were in compliance. District Compliant was the standard used to indicate full compliance. Only 5 items out of 67 were not District Compliant. All items have been resolved and bring SSD’s Consolidated Federal Programs 2004-2005 documentation into 100% compliance.
Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Surveys

Phone surveys were completed with 50 of the 70 parents/guardians of students who received reading specialist services under Title I.A/II.A, yielding a 71% return rate (Appendix 5-1). There were a total of 22 items on the parent phone survey. The ratings for 16 of the items were based on yes/no answers and are reported as the percent of parents who responded “yes.” Six of the yes/no questions were parent preferences on topics for the Title I.A Newsletter (Appendix 5-2) and will not be considered either a strength or weakness. The ratings for 6 items were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing strongly disagrees and a rating of 5 denoting strongly agrees. Overall, the parents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed or answered yes on the majority of items. There were five areas of strength on the items for which scores were at or above a 4.0 average. There were four areas of strength on the yes indicators for which scores were above 70%. The strengths are noted in Table 1.

Table 1. Strength Areas on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (mean of 4.0 and above)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement activities were very enjoyable.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the Title I.A/II.A program.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child likes participating in the Title I.A/II.A program.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I parent Newsletter was very useful.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-A-Story stories were very enjoyable for child.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (70% or above)</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement activities were a good experience.</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s reading and writing have improved this year.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent would be willing to be called to get their perspective if changes were being made.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent indicated having read monthly Title I.A Newsletters.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was one indicator for which the score was still above average, but fell below 4.0. There were two yes indicators that fell in the 50 to 70 percent range. These areas are considered progressing. They are itemized in Table 2.

Table 2. Progressing Areas on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (mean between 3.0-4.0)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The degree of reading and writing improvement this year.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (50-70%)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar with the types of activities child does in Title I.A/II.A classes.</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have met or talked with the reading specialist.</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were five yes indicators that fell below 50%. These areas are considered areas of concern and all deal with parent participation and interest. They are itemized in Table 3.

Table 3. Concern Areas on Parent Phone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (below 50%)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child talks about the Title I.A/II.A at home.</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent was interested in serving on a school or district parent committee.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family listened to Dial-A-Story.</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent participated in parent at activities at their child’s school this year.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent participated in SSD workshops listed in Parent Newsletter.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title I.A/II.A Program Surveys**

Feedback was gathered from teachers and administrators concerning the effectiveness of the Title I program in their buildings. Program surveys were sent to both administrators at the schools that have Title I.A/II.A reading programs: Ackerman, Northview, Litzsinger, Neuwoehner, Bridges, JDC, Lakeside, and Southview. Surveys were also sent to the Title I staff and the teachers who have students who receiving Title I services. A total of 59 surveys were sent out. There were 48 returned for a return rate of 81% (Appendix 5-3).

There were a total of 8 items on the program survey. The ratings for 3 of the items were based on yes/no answers. Two of the yes/no indicators are reported as the percent of SSD staff who responded “yes” and one as the percent of SSD staff who responded “no.” The ratings for 4 items were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing
strongly disagrees and a rating of 5 denoting strongly agrees. On one item participants were asked to check which reading/writing cross-curricular activities the reading specialist could assist the teacher or school. Overall, administrators and staff indicated that the reading programs paid for with Title I.A and II.A funds are effective and implemented successfully. There were three areas of strength on the items for which scores were at or above a 4.0 average. There were two areas of strength on the yes indicator for which scores were above 70%. There was one area of strength on the no indicator for which scores were above 70%. The strengths are noted in Table 4.

Table 4. Strength Areas on TitleI.A/II.A Program Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (mean above 4.0)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program benefits my students.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the way that students are scheduled into the program.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent of the benefit is very great.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (above 70%)</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a benefit to reading specialists and collaborative teachers planning together.</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants are aware of the purpose and expectations of the program.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (above 70%)</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a need for further clarification of regulations for Title I?</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was one item for which the score was still above average, but fell below 4.0. This area is considered progressing and is itemized in Table 5. There were no areas of concern.

Table 5. Progressing Area on TitleI.A/II.A Program Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (mean between 3.0-4.0)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the participant’s view the impact they have on implementing and enhancing the program.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title I.A Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Alternate Data**

DESE has not been able to determine AYP for the Special Education School using MAP scores, due to the low number of students that take the MAP at any given grade level. In September of 2002 DESE has approved using alternate data to determine the effectiveness of SSD’s Title I.A program. Figure 1 shows the cumulative expectancy results for broad reading on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery- Revised (WJ-R) for students in the Title I.A program. At the end of the 2003-2004 school year, 35%
of the 43 students who received instruction from the Title I.A reading specialist in the area of reading were reading at expectancy, a level commensurate with their ability. Significant increases (23% more) in reading were achieved between FY01 and FY02. Students achieving expectancy has remained fairly even over the last three years. Over one third of the students achieving expectancy during the last three years confirms the benefit of Title I.A instruction (Figure 1).

Figure 1.
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Of the 24 students who were not at expectancy in reading at the end of the year and had received services for at least 6 months, 21 made progress (88%) as measured by their performance on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) (Figure 2).

Figure 2.
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For the 48 students who received help with writing, 40% were at expectancy at the end of the 2003-2004 school year as measured by the WJ-R broad written language score. Trend data over the last 4 years in written language shows a positive trend (Figure 3).

![Figure 3. Title I.A Cumulative Expectancy Results](image)

Title I.A also tracks data to determine if students maintain reading and writing at expectancy from the end of one school year to the beginning of the next. The students who maintain expectancy exit the Title I.A program. In September 2005, 80% of the 10 students who returned to the special education schools who were reading at expectancy in May 2005, maintained expectancy (Figure 4) based on WJ-R broad reading scores. Trend data for reading jumped from 33% to 89% between FY02 and FY03, and then flattened out over the next two years.

![Figure 4. BROAD READING on WJ-R EXPECTANCY MAINTENANCE](image)
Of the 15 returning written language students who were at expectancy in May 2005, 60% maintained expectancy (Figure 5) as measured by the WJ-R broad reading score. Written language trend data showed an increase of 24 percentage points between FY02 and FY03, then declined over the next two years.

Due to the small sample size, caution should be taken when making generalizations about the data for students maintaining expectancy. The best use of this data is to determine programming for individual students. After testing is completed in the fall, data on each student is reviewed by the Title I coordinator, building supervisor, and Title I.A reading specialist and programming adjustments are made.
Title I.A reading and written language cumulative expectancy results were disaggregated by race and gender. Title I.A cumulative expectancy data in spring 2004 for reading and written language indicated there was a small achievement gap between black and white students (Figures 6 & 7). No statistical comparison can be made here because of the small cell/sample size.

Figure 6.
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Disaggregated Title I.A Cumulative Expectancy Results
Written Language Achievement
Fall to Spring FY03 and FY04
Disaggregated gender data was difficult to interpret because of the small sample size for females (Figures 8 & 9).

Figure 8.
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Figure 9.

![Disaggregated Title I.A Cumulative Expectancy Results Written Language Achievement Fall to Spring FY02, FY03 and FY04](image)
The alternative literacy data used to access students’ progress, and ultimately the success of the professional development funded by Title II.A, is a continuum of 5 literacy assessments: Story Observation Checklist (SOC), Checklist of Emergent Literacy Skills (COELS), Beginning Reading Test (BRT), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), and the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI). The assessments are given in the fall and spring each year to all students in the special education schools in grades K-10. Students are given the assessment that fits their literacy skills. As students increase their skills, the next level of assessment is given. Students demonstrate progress in one or more ways: increasing their score on an assessment and/or moving to a higher-level assessment.

During the 2004-2005 school year 79% of all K-10 students in the special education schools demonstrated progress in literacy (Figure 10). In FY03 pilot assessment tools were added for students taking the MAP-A. Assessments for MAP-A students were redesigned in FY04 to better measure literacy skills of students with the most significant disabilities. Teachers’ skill in giving the assessments has increased over the past two years, possibly explaining the change in scores over the last two years. Literacy Advisory Committees will be reviewing the data in May 2005. Future professional development needs funded through Title II.A will be determined by this analysis.
The special education schools’ disaggregated literacy data for 2004-2005 show that more black students made progress than white students (Figure 11). Due to the small sample size for Asians and Hispanics, no generalizations can be made.

In 2004-2005 more female students made progress than male students (Figure 12).
Title II.D Professional Development for Technology Data

Fourteen multi-part and six one-part, high quality instructional technology trainings funded by Title II.D funds occurred for the 2004-2005 school year in which 156 staff members participated. Sign in sheets and the professional development activity evaluation forms were completed as required. The instructional technology specialists and supervisor reviewed collected data at the completion of each training. All participants completed the Professional Development Activity Evaluation Form.

- 96% of the participants who took part in the FirstClass for SSD training were able to communicate effectively with supervisors and other staff as required by logging into and using FirstClass outside of the workshop setting. This statistical data was compiled by FirstClass Server Administrators collecting information from all individual user accounts on the server.

- 88% of the participants who took part in the Inspiration/Kidspiration training were able to utilize technology to assist students in the educational environment using Inspiration/Kidspiration Software. They presented Inspiration/Kidspiration graphic organizers that they made both for and with their students that were used in their classroom settings as a sharing activity at the end of the second part of the training.

- 100% of the participants (teachers) in the Multimedia Tools for Mac OS X training were able to teach and assist students in the creation of multimedia projects and other reports using technology. This was demonstrated by multimedia projects created both for and with the students that were used in their educational setting. The projects were presented as a sharing activity at the end of the second part of the training. 100% of the participants also responded that the session’s content and skill development is directly linked to improved student learning to meet the Missouri Show-Me Standards at the proficient level, that they can implement the skills taught, and that as a result of the staff development activity they have seen an increase in student achievement. (This information was gathered from individual Professional Development Activity Evaluation Forms, specifically questions 4, 10, 11.)

- 84% of the participants in the Introduction to OSX training responded that the session’s content and skill development is directly linked to improved student learning to meet the Missouri Show-Me Standards at the proficient level, that they can implement the skills taught, and that as a result of the staff development activity they have seen an increase in student achievement. (This information was gathered from individual Professional Development Activity Evaluation Forms, specifically questions 4, 10, 11.)
• 100% of the participants in the End Product training were able to create instructional materials to enhance student learning. They presented projects they made for their students for use in their classroom settings as a sharing activity at the end of the second part of the training. All participants completed at least 5 projects using software and web resources. 66% of the participants followed up by sending presenters further examples of projects that they had made and used in their classroom environment weeks after the training was completed (participants were then sent free materials for completing this extra step).

Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 Data

Goal 1. The incidence of physical and verbal aggression towards staff and students experienced by students in the special education schools will decrease by 3% by the end of the 2003-2004 school year as evidenced by a decrease in the number of physical and verbal intervention referral as shown on PBS data.

Four special education schools used the Second Step violence prevention curriculum (a researched-based, DESE approved program) in conjunction with their Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) system to decrease physical and verbal aggressions referrals. The other two schools used different programs, but used PBS data to track referrals. Analysis of special education schools’ PBS data for the 2003-2004 school year showed a decrease of 27.16% in the total number of physical and verbal aggression intervention referrals as compared to the previous year (Figure 13). This far exceeded the 3% goal.

Figure 13
Goal 2. Students in the Special Education Schools will demonstrate an increase of 3% in acceptable social behavior as measured by pre/posttest data to be completed by May 2004.

The special education schools provided instruction in positive, acceptable social behavior for their students through training with Mr. Ray Amanat. Amanat’s Conflict Resolution Anger Management (C.R.A.M.) classes increased the application of positive social skills. Training included modeling and role-play and was held in multiple sessions throughout the year. Teachers reinforced the skills in the classroom. Post-testing indicated an increase of 21% in students’ understanding and application of acceptable social behavior, exceeding the 3% goal (Figure 14).

Figure 14.
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Goal 3. By May 2004 students in the technical high schools and court programs will increase by 10% their knowledge of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs as measured by pre/posttest data.

Activities to increase ATOD knowledge were designed to fit the various student populations. Increase in knowledge was measured by pre and post-test assessments of ATOD activities at the court programs and the technical high schools. Across all populations there was an increase of 26% in ATOD knowledge, exceeding the goal (Figure 15). The court programs used the Here’s Looking at You 2000 ATOD curriculum in conjunction with ATOD speakers. After North Technical’s Great American Smoke Out program, 22% of the 72 students surveyed indicated they quit or wanted to quit smoking as a result of the program (Figure 16). Post-test results from North Technical’s Teenage Health Consultants program indicated that fewer students who participated in that program were smoking and drinking regularly by the end of the 2003-2004 school year as compared to the start of the year.
In summary all Title IV.A goals were met for the 2003-2004 school year. In May of 2004 the Title IV.A Advisory committee met to review the data from the year, the parent survey results, and the community and parent group feedback. Based on the analysis of all the data, the committee established goals and activities for 2004-2005. Title IV.A activities continue to focus on reducing physical and verbal aggression, increasing ATOD knowledge, and increasing acceptable social behavior. The technical schools and court programs added an additional goal of decreasing the use of and/or desire to use alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD). It was also recommended that the Title IV.A Safe and Drug Free Newsletter continue to be sent to parents of students in the special education
schools and technical schools twice a year and a parent survey be done mid-year. Results for 2004-2005 will be reviewed at the end of May 2005 and used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program. Results for 2004-2005 will be reported in a fall issue of Special Edition and will be posted on SSD’s web site.

**Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey**

Surveys were sent to all families with a child in the special education schools and technical high schools. Of the 2,865 surveys sent home with second quarter report cards/progress reports, 124 were completed for a return rate of 4%. The Technical High Schools had a return rate of 1% (28 out of 2032), while the special education schools had a return rate of 11% (96 out of 883).

Several concerns surfaced around the Title IV Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey (Appendix 4-6). The low return rate from the technical education schools made interpreting the results difficult. In addition, there were some questions about the reliability of the survey. During the survey process, we received feedback from parents and staff on the ambiguity of the first section of the survey. Parents indicated they did not know how to rate their concern about safety, alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs issues. Was it a concern with their child at school or the community at large? It became apparent that the questions were not clear. Parents could interpret the issues in a global way, instead of focusing at the school level. On the Title IV.A survey, parents’ perceptions of school safety issues were rated as “concerned.” Results of the MSIP Parent Survey (Appendix 5-4) completed by parents in October 2004 revealed a different finding than the Title IV.A parent survey on parents concerns about the safety of their children at school. On the MSIP parent survey (Item 34), the parents of special education and technical education schools students felt that their children were safe at school. The mean of this statement was 4.1 on the 5-point Likert scale with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 5 meaning strongly agree. The return rate on the MSIP parent survey was 25% (773 out of 3,130). Due to the ambiguity of the Title IV.A survey questions on parents’ concerns on school safety issues and the conflicting data from the MSIP parent survey, we could not determine if the concern was a school issue or a community issue.

In summary, because of the small sample size, confusing survey questions, and the conflicting data from the October 2004 MSIP Parent Survey, the results of the Title IV.A survey were not considered reliable, and the results are not reported. Recommendations will address the flaws/ambiguity of the survey and the low return rate.
Title V.A Assistive Technology Training-Toolkits

Results of Using Toolkit Items with Students:

Cohorts 2002-03 (teams starting training in fall 2002) and Cohorts 2003-04 (teams starting in fall 2003) were able to use their toolkit items (received during training) to design, modify, or adapt curricular activities and implement those activities with their students. Of the seventeen teams, two teams were unable to complete the trial period with their students. Fifteen teams reported successful outcomes and goals met for their students. Teams either shared quantitative data or qualitative data related to the expected changes in their student’s performance. All teams were able to demonstrate the activity they created for their students. Teams reported data collection methods to include pre/post work samples and recorded prompts needed to complete written assignments, time samples, response charting and observation charts.

Tables 6 and 7 indicate the expected change in student performance, software used, and evidence of change for Cohort 2002-03 and Cohort 2003-04.

Table 6: AT Toolkit Results for Cohort 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Change in Student Performance (Strand)</th>
<th>Increase Written Expression Skills</th>
<th>Increase Reading Skills</th>
<th>Increase Task Focus</th>
<th>Demonstration of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit item (software)</td>
<td>Pixwriter</td>
<td>Intellipics Studio</td>
<td>Intellitalk 2</td>
<td>Draftbuilder software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Change</td>
<td>Able to write more</td>
<td>Requesting books</td>
<td>Decrease of inappropriate during activity</td>
<td>Change in semester grade for that subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating complete sentences</td>
<td>more frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased ability to retain information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adding more details to sentences</td>
<td>Accessing electronic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased comprehension of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing written assignments</td>
<td>storybooks with greater independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Able to demonstrate knowledge for 1st time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing with increased speed and accuracy</td>
<td>Attending to electronic book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing written activities with greater independence</td>
<td>Independently turning pages of book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requiring fewer cues to write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: AT Toolkit Results for Cohort 2003-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolkit item (software)</th>
<th>Evidence of Change</th>
<th>Cohort – 2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pixwriter software</td>
<td>Able to write more</td>
<td>Expected Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntelliTalk 2 software</td>
<td>Creating and completing sentences</td>
<td>in Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellipics Studio software</td>
<td>Adding more details to sentences</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftbuilder</td>
<td>Completing written assignments</td>
<td>(Strand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing with increased speed and accuracy</td>
<td>Increase Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing written activities with greater independence</td>
<td>Expression Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requiring fewer cues to write</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntelliTalk 2 software</td>
<td>Requesting books more frequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellipics Studio software</td>
<td>Accessing electronic storybooks with greater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker4 software</td>
<td>Attending to electronic book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independently turning pages of book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AT Team members were able to use toolkit items to design or modify activities for their students. Teams also reported that their students demonstrated increased levels of confidence, choice making, and preference for using assistive technology for completing assignments after the implementation of the AT activity.

Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee

At the January 27, 2005 the committee reviewed the purpose and uses of funds for each entitlement grant. A few clarification questions were asked. Three topics were discussed at length: smoking on SSD campuses, smoking prevention and cessation education, and the Title IV.A Parent Survey. The majority of the discussion centered on smoking issues. Parents who had children in the special education schools felt the schools should be smoke-free campuses. They said that students were being sent mixed messages and SSD staff was setting a bad example for the students. SSD staff, the authority figures and instructional leaders in the schools, was smoking right outside the building where children could see them. The message children were receiving in class was that smoking was harmful and not to do it. One parent said her child had come to her expressing concern for the safety of his teacher who he had observed smoking outside the school. A
lengthy discussion ensued on the issue of smoking education. All felt that prevention and cessation strategies, if appropriate for the student population, had to be taught along with teaching the harmful effects of tobacco use. One parent who had particular expertise in this area, felt peer pressure needed to be addressed to have any impact on cessation. He volunteered his time to work with the technical schools in their smoking prevention/cessation efforts. His name was passed along to the technical school administrators, as well as technical schoolteachers who work in this area.

At the end of the meeting the discussion turned to the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Parent Survey that had been sent out in January. Parents were unsure how to respond to the first section of the survey where they were to think about the students in our district and reply to how concerned they were about bullying, verbal abuse by students, physical fights, level of violent acts by students, the reported use of alcohol, tobacco, and illegal drugs. It was decided that at the May 19 meeting, the committee would review the survey for possible improvements.

The agenda for the May 19, 2005 meeting will include year-end data from all the grants. Committee members will have the opportunity to give input on goals for 2005-2006. Also the format of the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey will be reviewed for possible revision.

**Public Forum**

No one attended the public forum despite the extensive efforts to advertise, so there were no results to report.

**Cost Analysis**

Cost analysis for Consolidated Federal Programs will focus on three areas: a historical perspective of the funding from DESE over the last seven years, the process for determining allocation use, and actual allocation use over the last two years.
Consolidated Federal Programs Allocation from DESE

Over the last 7 years SSD’S total Consolidated Federal Programs allocation has dropped more than $220,000, from a high of $860,279 to a low of $640,212 for this school year (Figure 17). This is a 26% reduction.

Figure 17.

The downward trend is not consistent across all grants. Title I funds have dropped nearly 38% over the last 7 years with funding holding steady at around $465,000 the last two years (Figure 18).

Figure 18.
Title II.A funds for professional development has increased tremendously (Figure 19). In FY00, FY01, and FY02 the district received a Class Size Reduction (CSR) grant that the Department of Education eventually rolled into Title II.A. When CSR and Title II.A. allocations are combined for those years, funding increased 436% from $27,100 to $145,286.

![Figure 19](special_school_districts_consolidated_federal_programs_allocation.png)

Title II.D funds for technology came into existence in the 2002-2003 school year and have increased by 15%, a little more than $1,000 over the last 3 years (Figure 20). The allocation for 2004-2005 is $8,623.

![Figure 20](special_school_districts_consolidated_federal_programs_allocation.png)
Drastic reductions have occurred in the funding for Title IV.A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities over the last 7 years (Figure 21). The Title IV.A allocation has been reduced by 66% to $11,423.

**Figure 21.**

![Special School District's Consolidated Federal Programs' Allocation Title IV.A](image)

Title V.A, formerly known as Title VI before 2002-2003, has had the most drastic funding cuts of all the grants over the last seven years, a drop of 82% (Figure 22). During 2004-2005 the Title V.A: Innovative Programs allocation was $8,882, down from $49,571 in 1998-1999.

**Figure 22.**

![Special School District's Consolidated Federal Programs' Allocation Title V.A & Title VI](image)
The ups and downs of allocations are a result of changes in federal priorities, funding formulas, and free and reduced lunch counts. SSD’s free and reduced lunch count for the past 7 years is shown in Figure 23. SSD has had to adjust programming based on the allocation changes.

Figure 23.

![SSD’s Free and Reduced Lunch Count](image)

**Process for Determining Allocation Use**

Expenditures for the Consolidated Federal Programs are aligned with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Standards and Indicators. The activities funded by the grants are directly tied to and referenced in the district’s Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). The Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist and the Federal Programs Administrative Manual provide the district with the framework needed to implement programs that meet the standards set for each grant.

The checklist uses the school improvement process to help districts determine goals and programming activities. Schools/programs are held accountable for collecting data on the programs and activities funded by the federal government, analyzing the data to determine strengths/weaknesses/progress, and then making necessary changes to goals and activities based on the analysis. The process is repeated each school year.

The goals for the Consolidated Federal Programs are tied to the MSIP standards and the district wide/regional CSIP goal of increased academic achievement. An advisory group unique to that grant establishes priorities for each grant. In the case of Title I, the targeted assistance schools determine how funds will be used. Over the last 6 years, the targeted assistance buildings have requested as much reading specialist support as their grant funds will allow. Funds have been flexed into Title I and V to provide as much reading specialist/literacy coach support as possible for the special education schools.
majority of funding for those programs goes to salaries and benefits. Any money that a building has leftover after salaries and benefits are taken out is budgeted by the building for materials, supplies, and parent involvement costs, according to their needs.

Four literacy advisory committees determine activities funded for professional development under Title II.A: Elementary MAP, Elementary MAP-A, Secondary MAP, and Secondary MAP-A. Each committee is made up of teacher level staff and administrators from the special education schools. Instructional Facilitators also serve on several of the committees. The Federal Programs Coordinator chairs the committees. The committees plan the professional development activities based on district literacy testing data, feedback from their peers, and an annual needs assessment.

The Instructional Technology In-service Development Committee determines the funding activities for Title II.D. The committee uses the following sources of data to make its training decisions: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and National Education Technology Standards (NETS) standards in coordination with SSD’s Technology Plan, SSD’s software committee recommendations, SSD’s Technology Plan, recommendations of workshop presenters, and review and analysis of professional development feedback form comments from the previous year’s training.

The special education schools and technical schools plan Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities activities through their representatives on the Title IV.A Advisory Committee. The committee reviews year-end data that includes pre/post tests, Core Data on violence and alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs incidences, Title IV.A Parent Survey results, and Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) results, and goals are set for the next year. The building staff then determines what activities they will implement and identify funding to meet those goals.

As with the other grants, the school improvement process drives the goals and activities for Title V.A. The Computer Access Facilitators along and their supervisor review technical team training data to determine activities funded through Title V.A. The process for determining how the allocations are used is basically the same for all grants. The difference is in the committee that reviews the data for progress and determines the goals and activities.

Allocation Use and Spending Breakdown

Another cost analysis method for the Consolidated Federal Programs is to look at how the funds for each grant were spent in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. Seventy-six percent of SSD’S total Consolidated Federal Programs allocation for 2004-2005 was spent on salaries and benefits, a nine percent decrease from the previous year (Appendix 5-5). Salaries and benefits accounted for the bulk of Title I spending, 84% (Appendix 5-6). Spending for Title I was very similar to the previous year. For Title II.D 91% of the allocation was spent on salaries and benefits in FY05 (Appendix 5-6). The pattern of
spending for Title II.A, IV.A, and V.A looked different between FY04 and FY05. The variation in how funds are spent for the three grants reflects shifting priorities based on needs assessments and analysis of program data (Appendix 5-7).

In summary, the basic process for determining the use of federal funds is very similar across the grants. The committee that reviews the data and determines the activities is different from grant to grant. The Federal Programs Coordinator chairs all groups and is responsible for budgeting and application writing.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The committee members met to review, assimilate, and analyze the program evaluation data. Through discussion and questioning, the committee identified areas of strength and weakness that were noted across multiple data sources.

Strengths

Evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program Implementation

- Several areas of strength were identified. The analysis of the evaluation of Consolidated Federal Programs implementation indicated that the programs are being implemented very successfully and with validity. No major discrepancy existed between actual program implementation and desired implementation. Ninety-three percent of the items (62 of 67 items) on the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist were in compliance. All items are easily resolved.

Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Survey

Based on the Title I.A/II.A Parent Phone Survey, Parents are very satisfied with the implementation of the Title I/II.A literacy program. The following strengths were noted:

- Parents were very satisfied with the program and the progress their children were making in reading and writing.
- When parents participated in school activities, the activities were rated a very positive experience.
- Parents felt the Title I.A Newsletter was very useful and an effective method of communicating parenting and educational issues.
- Parents’ ideas are solicited and acted upon.
- Free transportation to school activities is offered to parents of Title I.A/II.A students.
- Participation in the survey was high.
- Parent involvement policies inform parents of the opportunities available to them for participation in school activities.
Title I.A/II.A Program Survey
Based on the results of the Title I.A/II.A Program Survey of administrators and staff, the following strengths were noted:

• Administrators and staff strongly agreed that the literacy program was a great benefit to their students.
• Administrators and staff were very satisfied with the implementation of the program in respect to scheduling and collaborative planning.
• Administrators and staff had a very clear understanding of the regulations that guide the program.

Title I.A Adequate Yearly Progress
Instructional strengths were noted in the Title I.A literacy program:

• Students receiving reading and/or writing instruction from the reading specialist continue to make progress.
• Title I.A students are reaching and maintaining expectancy, despite the severity of the disabilities of the students in the special education schools.
• Maintenance of skills is being tracked.
• Title I.A students exit the program based on fall scores, making sure there has not been regression over the summer.
• Students who do not reach expectancy by the end of the year, are still making progress based on DRA scores.
• Progress is being monitored and planning is done for those students who do not reach expectancy.
• Title I.A cumulative expectancy data in spring 2004 for reading and written language indicated there was almost no achievement gap between black and white students.

Title II.A Professional Development and Special Education Schools Literacy Data
Based on the results of the special education schools professional development and literacy data, the following strengths were noted:

• Teachers receive ongoing professional development on how to administer and interpret literacy assessments.
• Students in the special education schools are demonstrating increased literacy skills.
• Literacy skills of all students in grades K-10 in the special education schools are being assessed using a continuum of 5 literacy assessments.
Title II.D Professional Development for Technology Data

Strengths noted in the professional development for technology Title II.D program are as follows:

- Instructional staff are able to integrate acquired skills into daily instructional activities as a result of the professional development they receive.
- Multipart training includes follow up and support through email, phone, and online tutorials provided by the district.
- SSD’s trainings are aligned with ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education) standards and NETS (National Educational Technology Standards).

Title IV.A Safe & Drug-Free Schools and Communities 2003-2004 Data

Several strengths were noted based on the year-end data from Title IV.A:

- All goals were met for 2003-2004.
- Data was used to determine progress and set goals.
- Goals and programming were based on site-based student needs.
- The existing PBS data collection method was used to collect data for goal one, so teachers had less paperwork to complete.
- The methods used to keep parents informed about school safety and ATOD issues were effective, especially newsletters, workshops and trainings.

Title V.A Assistive Technology (AT) Training and Toolkits

Using the toolkit results and reflections of the AT teams, following strengths were noted:

- Fifteen out of seventeen AT teams reported their student improved in the selected area of performance as a result of the use of the assistive technology toolkit items.
- Toolkits and multi-session hands-on trainings helped participants develop competence and skill in use of the toolkit items.
- Toolkit software was used to create activities for students as well as the targeted student.
- AT teams were able to use toolkit items to design or modify activities for their students.

Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee

Parent involvement strengths can be noted from the Federal Programs Parent Advisory Committee.

- The committee included representations from all schools and federal programs.
- There was productive, proactive involvement and parents were interested in continued involvement.
Progressing

Evaluation of Consolidated Federal Program Implementation

There were five (5 out of 67) minor discrepancies on the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist. Actions taken since the documentation review ensure that 2004-2005 documentation is in 100% compliance. The five items scored District Resolving been resolved. Since DESE uses the documentation from the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist to do their MSIP review for Federal Programs, SSD is compliant moving into the MSIP year.

Actions Taken

- Developed a process for including the Complaint Procedure in future Technical School Parent/Student Handbooks. For 2004-2005 the Complaint Procedure was sent to all parents/guardians of technical high school students with third quarter report cards.
- Developed a form to be used by reading specialists for yearly plans that would show the coordination between the reading specialist and the classroom teacher.
- Title I schedules and collaborative note forms were redesigned to clearly show that regularly scheduled meetings were held to plan instruction.
- Worked with the building attendance secretaries to develop a process to notify the principal and Federal Programs Coordinator when a teacher has been out more than 20 consecutive teaching days and has been replaced by a non-certified person. The process included letters being sent to parents with a copy of the letter being sent to the Federal Programs Coordinator to document the notification. A sample letter was developed as a model for principals. The sample letter was included in the documentation file.
- A list of parent involvement activities was developed and included in the documentation file.
- Each building developed in conjunction with parents, a building-level parent involvement plan that includes strategies for communication, a description of how the parent-school compact was developed and its purpose, and strategies for increasing opportunities for parent involvement.
Consolidated Federal Programs Implementation

The analysis of the evaluation of Consolidated Federal Programs implementation indicated two minor areas of concern: documentation and parent involvement issues. No major discrepancy existed between actual program implementation and desired implementation. The documentation and parent involvement items have been resolved for 2004-2005, bringing the district into full compliance.

Parent Participation

Even though schools have parent involvement policies and provide opportunities for parents to participate in school activities, parents’ attendance at school activities is low. Fifty-three percent of parents report talking to or meeting the Title I teacher with which their child works.

Special Education Schools Literacy Data

While remaining high, the percent of students who have made progress in literacy skills has dropped in 2004-2005. Further analysis by the four literacy advisory committees needs to done to determine future direction for the literacy instructional programs for students in the special education schools. Professional development activities funded through Title II.A should reflect this analysis. Also, due to the subjectivity of the continuum of literacy assessments, rater reliability may be in question.

Technology Training

Due to low registration for technology trainings, eleven out of thirty-one scheduled trainings were cancelled. Fewer people attended the trainings in comparison to previous years. During 2003-2004 school year, 254 staff members attended training compared to only 156 this year. Attendance has fallen off since the change in district guidelines on release time for professional development, the required new teacher training, and the advent of Encore.

Parent Concerns about Safe and Drug-Free Schools Issues

One of the weaknesses of the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Parent Survey was that the survey questions were not clear. Questions need to be revised and be clearly focused on the parents’ concern about ATOD, violence, and bullying issues in school, instead of the community at large. The Title IV.A winter 2005 survey results conflicted with the October 2004 MSIP Parent Survey results. Also, the return rate for the survey was very small making interpretation of the results difficult.
**Limitations**

The data collected for this evaluation provided the committee with a significant amount of information that had not previously been reviewed as a whole to lead towards systemic improvement. However, in the process of data analysis, the committee noted several limitations that may have affected the reported results. These limitations should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results and designing future program evaluation activities.

1. Student input was not included.

2. The Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey had some design flaws. It was difficult to tell if parents’ concerns were about problems in the schools or the community at large. Also the return rate was very small.

3. Due to the small numbers when Title I data is disaggregated, one must be cautious when drawing conclusions.

4. The process of how instruction was given was not evaluated for Title II.A: Training and Recruiting Highly Qualified Teachers and Principals.

5. Student outcome data used to evaluate some Title II.D technology professional development was reflected through teacher feedback only.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations address identified needs concerning the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist implementation; lack of parent participation; Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey; and trainings for literacy instruction, assistive technical teams, and technology. The following recommendations align with the district rolling plan objectives. Action plans will be developed pending approval of the Board.

1. Assure continuity of Consolidated Federal Programs documentation across all schools as defined by the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist.
2. Continue to monitor changes in the Consolidated Federal Programs Self-Monitoring Checklist and adjust programming and documentation to assure future compliance.

3. Review/revise parent contact process with Title I staff.

4. Analyze district literacy data and plan future professional development needs based on assessment results’ analysis.

5. Increase attendance at scheduled technology trainings by adjusting training schedule, advertising to targeted populations, and linking trainings to national technology standards and MSIP indicators.

6. Redesign the Title IV.A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Survey and investigate processes that result in higher return rates. Involve both special education and technical school administrators in the survey revisions.
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ALLOCATION FORMULAS FOR 2005-2006 FEDERAL PROGRAMS

TITLE I, Part A
IMPROVING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Allotment to State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education - 100%
  95% - LEA Allotment
  4% - SEA Program Improvement
    • 95% of Program Improvement Funds go directly to schools not at the base level for Annual Yearly Progress
    • 5% of Program Improvement Funds is for Technical Assistance and Support
  1% - SEA Administration

The U. S. Office of Education computes the Title I allocation for each school district using census poverty and census population for children ages 5-17, children in neglected or delinquent institutions, and foster children. Large districts (LEAs serving an area with a total population of 20,000 or more) will receive their allocation based solely on census poverty data.

Beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, Missouri has requested approval from the USDE to use the following data to distribute Title I, Part A funds to LEAs serving an area with a total population of less than 20,000. The Missouri Board of Education approved the use of this alternative data during their February 2004 meeting.

Alternative poverty data, used to distribute Title I funds to LEAs
2000 census poverty data and foster child counts (multiplied by .80)
January 2005 free/reduced price lunch counts as reported on Core Data (multiplied by .20)
October 2004 caseload counts of children in locally operated institutions for neglected children (multiplied by 1.00)

Alternative populations of children ages 5-17, used to compute poverty percentage
2000 census population of children ages 5 - 17 (multiplied by .80)
January 2005 enrollment counts as reported on Core Data (multiplied by .20)
October 2004 caseload counts of children in locally operated institutions for neglected children (multiplied by 1.00)
NEGLECTED INSTITUTIONS -- Neglected funds are part of the district’s allocated funds. Using the January membership counts and the neglected counts of October 2004, funds are distributed to neglected institutions based upon a $ per child amount.

DELINQUENT INSTITUTIONS – A separate grant is given for delinquent institutions. Each eligible delinquent institution receives their proportionate amount based upon their October 2004 count.

The Title I allocation consists of four separate funding calculations: Basic Grant, Concentration Grant, Targeted Grant, and Education Finance Incentive Grant (EFIG). Each funding category has different criteria and formula to distribute these funds. Formula count is defined for large districts (total population of 20,000 or more) as census poverty + neglected count + foster child count and for small districts (total population of less than 20,000) as alternative poverty data.

LEA ELIGIBILITY
- Basic Grants: At least 10 formula children and the number must exceed 2 percent of the district’s 5-17 population.
- Concentration Grants: More than 6,500 formula children or 15 percent of the district’s 5-17 population
- Targeted Grants: At least 10 formula children and the number must be at least 5 percent of the district’s 5-17 population
- Education Finance Incentive Grants: Same as Targeted Grants

HOLD-HARMLESS GUARANTEE
- All 4 formulas provide for a variable hold-harmless guarantee for each LEA of 85, 90, and 95% of their previous year’s allocation
- The hold-harmless percentage depends on the formula child rate of each LEA
- For Basic, Targeted, and EFIG, an LEA must meet the eligibility criteria in order for hold-harmless protection to apply
- For Concentration Grants, the hold-harmless provision applies to an LEA for four years even if it no longer meets the eligibility criteria

Hold Harmless Amounts – The amount made available to the LEA shall be:
- Not less than 95% of the amount made available for the preceding fiscal year if the percentage of formula children is not less than 30%
- Not less than 90% of the amount made available for the preceding fiscal year if the percentage of formula children is between 15% and 30%
- Not less than 85% of the amount made available for the preceding fiscal year if the percentage of formula children is below 15%

TITLE I BASIC GRANTS --
Minimum Number of Children to Qualify: 10 or more formula children and the number must exceed 2% of the district’s 5-17 population.
TITLE I CONCENTRATION GRANTS --
Minimum Number of Children to Qualify: 6,500 formula children or 15% of the district’s 5-17 population.

TITLE I TARGETED GRANTS --
Minimum Number of Children to Qualify: 10 or more formula children and the number must be at least 5% of the district’s 5-17 population.
Weights for Title I Targeted allocations to LEAs -- The larger of the weighted criteria by percentage of children or by number of children.
Weights by percentage of census poverty children: Weights by number of census poverty children:
<= 15.58% = 1.0 <= 691 = 1.0
> 15.58% <= 22.11% = 1.75 > 691 <= 2262 = 1.5
> 22.11% <= 30.16% = 2.5 > 2262 <= 7851 = 2.0
> 30.16% <= 38.24% = 3.25 > 7851 <= 35514 = 2.5
> 38.24 = 4.0 > 35514 = 3.0

TITLE I EDUCATION FINANCE INCENTIVE GRANT (EFIG) -- Based on Fiscal Effort and Equity
Minimum Number of Children to Qualify: 10 or more formula children and the number must be at least 5% of the district’s 5-17 population.
Weights for allocations to LEAs -- The larger of the weighted criteria by percentage of children or by number of children.
Weights for State by equity factor
Percentage of census poverty children
Equity factor < .10
Equity factor >= .10<.20
Equity factor >=.20
<= 15.58% 1.0 1.0 1.0
> 15.58% <= 22.11% 1.75 1.5 2.0
> 22.11% <= 30.16% 2.5 3.0 4.0
> 30.16% <= 38.24% 3.25 4.5 6.0
> 38.24 = 4.0 6.0 8.0
Weights for State by equity factor
Number of census poverty children
Equity factor < .10
Equity factor >= .10<.20
Equity factor >=.20
<= 691 = 1.0 1.0 1.0
> 691 <= 2262 = 1.5 1.5 2.0
> 2262 <= 7851 = 2.0 2.25 3.0
> 7851 <= 35514 = 2.5 3.375 4.5
The new law specifies that districts must allocate funds under these formulas (Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants) in the same way as other Title I funds, and use the money for Title I purposes. These two formulas drive more money to the highest poverty districts, based on census poverty numbers.

**TITLE I – PART D**
(PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT-RISK)
Subpart 1 – State Agencies
95% - State Agency Allotment (Department of Corrections and the Division of Youth Services)
4% - SEA Program Improvement
1% - SEA Administration
Allocations to State Agencies are based on the number of youth up to age 21 enrolled in their educational programs.
Subpart 2 – Local Agencies
95% - LEA Allotment
4% - SEA Program Improvement
1% - SEA Administration
Allocations to LEAs are based on the number of youth residing in local institutions as reported on the Annual Survey of Children in Local Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Children or in Correctional Institutions. There must be a minimum of 4.

**TITLE II – PART A**
(TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING FUND)
95% - LEA Allotment
2.5% - State Agency for Higher Education (Competitive Grants)
1% - SEA Administration
1.5% - SEA Statewide Activities
Hold Harmless – 100% of 2001-2002 Title II Eisenhower funds + 100% of 2001-2002 Class Size Reduction funds.
Additional funds over the hold harmless amount should be distributed as follows:
20% is distributed based on census population ages 5-17,
80% is distributed based on census poverty
For Title II.A purposes, equitable services to nonpublic schools applies only to the extent that the LEA uses funds to provide professional development to teachers and other educational staff.
The share of the LEA’s Title II.A funds that is used for professional development and subject to a determination of equitable expenditures shall be not less than the aggregate
amount of funds that were used for professional development for fiscal year 2001-2002 under Title II Eisenhower Professional Development and Class Size Reduction.

**TITLE II, PART D**  
**ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY**  
47.5% - Formula LEA Allotments (Grants Management Section)*  
47.5% - Competitive Grants (Instructional Technology Section)*  
5% - SEA Statewide Activities  
Formula LEA Grant is awarded to eligible LEAs by formula based on each LEA’s share of Title I, Part A funds for that year (2005-2006 Title I Allocation). Title II.D Competitive Grant allocation information is located at [http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/insttech/federalfunded/TitleIID/index.htm](http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/insttech/federalfunded/TitleIID/index.htm)  
* A portion of each of these allocations is withheld for bypass services to nonpublic schools.  
Nonpublic schools are served by Advanced Learning Technologies (ALTEC). USDE provides us with the contracted amount for Administration.  
- The nonpublic schools formula allocations are computed based on relative enrollment.  
- The nonpublic schools competitive grant allocations are computed based on relative enrollment of eligible schools.

**TITLE IV, PART A**  
**SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES**  
Allotment to Governor - 20%  
Allotment to State Agency for Elementary and Secondary Education - 80%  
93% of 80% - LEA Allotment  
60% of 93% - Distributed based on relative amount received under Part A of Title I for the preceding fiscal year  
40% of 93% - Distributed based on relative enrollment (public and non-profit nonpublic schools).  
3% of 80% - SEA Administration/ Uniform Management Information System  
4% of 80% - SEA State Level Activities  

**TITLE V, PART A**  
**INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS**  
Allotment to State Programs - 15% (Technical Assistance and Direct Grants to LEAs and Statewide education reform activities that assist LEAs to provide targeted assistance, and State Administration (Supervision, planning, monitoring, & evaluation)  
Allotment to LEAs-85%
100% of the allotment to LEAs should be distributed based on relative enrollment (public & nonpublic schools). The United States Secretary of Education has approved criteria for adjustments, such as, high concentration of children from low-income families and children living in sparsely populated areas. Under the formula, a weight of 1.0 is assigned to each pupil enrolled in an LEA, and additional weighting, in accordance with the criteria below, is assigned to each pupil enrolled in LEAs with the greatest number or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child:

- **Children from Low-Income Families** -- An additional weight of .5 is assigned to each pupil enrolled in an LEA with a concentration of census poverty children of 30-60%, and an additional weight of 1.0 is assigned to each pupil enrolled in an LEA with a concentration of census poverty children in excess of 60%.

- **Children Living in Sparsely Populated Areas (represented by children attending LEAs with small enrollments)** -- An additional weight of .5 is assigned to each pupil enrolled in an LEA with an enrollment of 250 to 350 pupils, and an additional weight of 1.0 is assigned to each pupil enrolled in an LEA with a total enrollment of fewer than 250 pupils.

- **The total number of weighted pupils in any LEA may not exceed two times the total enrollment.**

In Missouri, nonpublic schools are served through bypass (Blue Hills Home Corporation). The Blue Hills Home Corporation provides us with their contract amount for Administration. The nonpublic schools allocations are computed with the same weighted enrollment numbers as their resident school.
### SECTION 1 - NAME AND LOCATION OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
<th>ADDRESS OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>501 South Brentwood Blvd. Clayton, MO 63105</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>(314) 615-2974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PRINCIPAL OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Campbell, Superintendent</td>
<td>John Snipes, Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION II - CONSULTATION WITH DELINQUENT INSTITUTION

1. **NAME OF PERSONS REPRESENTING THE SCHOOLS IN SUCH CONSULTATIONS**

   **REPRESENTING THE PUBLIC SCHOOL**

   - Phyllis Kulp, Federal Programs Coordinator
   - Jane Ivol, Principal, JDC

   **REPRESENTING THE DELINQUENT INSTITUTION**

   - Cheryl Campbell, Superintendent
   - John Snipes, Assistant Superintendent

2. **GIVE DATES OF MEETINGS AND CONSULTATIONS HELD FOR PURPOSES OF COLLECTING BASIC DATA AND PLANNING THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DESCRIBED IN THIS DOCUMENT**

   - 8/29/03
   - 9/12/03
   - 10/20/03
   - 11/6/03
   - 11/24/03
   - 12/18/03
   - 1/5/04
   - 1/21/04
   - 2/18/04
   - 3/19/0
   - 4/14/04

### SECTION III - PARTICIPATION OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION AND ASSURANCES

1. **☑** THIS DELINQUENT INSTITUTION DOES WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES.

2. **☐** THIS DELINQUENT INSTITUTION DOES NOT WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES

**ASSURANCES**

THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY ASSURES THE CHIEF STATE OFFICER AND THE LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL THAT:

A. **ALL THE REQUIREMENTS SET FOURTH BY THE FEDERAL STATUTE AND ACCOMPANYING REGULATIONS AND RULES FOR DELINQUENT PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I, ESEA WILL BE SATISFACTORILY MET.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL OR OTHER REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TITLE I, PART D, DELINQUENT INSTITUTION PROGRAM PLAN

SECTION IV - PROGRAM PLAN

SPECIAL RULE

An LEA which includes a correctional facility that operates a school is not required to operate a dropout prevention program if more than 30% of the youth attending the facility will reside outside the boundaries of the local educational agency upon leaving the facility.

PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE DELINQUENT, OR AT-RISK OF DROPPING OUT

The LEA in which an eligible delinquent institution is located, and which desires assistance to operate prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk of dropping out shall:

1. Describe the program to be assisted with Title I funds.

The purpose of the Juvenile Detention Center, part of the Family Court of St. Louis County, is to provide safe, secure custody for juveniles in an environment of care, guidance and control. Juveniles who are alleged to have committed a law violation are detained if it is believed that they present a threat to themselves or the community. They remain in detention until the Court hears their case or until the appropriate alternative arrangements can be made.

By law, most status offenders (runaways, curfew violators, and juveniles who are beyond their parents control) cannot be detained in a secure facility. When these juveniles need temporary placement outside of the home, they are detained in St. Louis County’s Lakeside Shelter Care facility or other non-secure facilities located in the community.

Detained residents are involved in a comprehensive program of educational, recreational and social activities that require close staff/resident interaction. It is through this personal contact that a climate conducive to behavioral change develops. Detention staff utilizes both counseling and correctional skills as part of the behavioral management program that focuses on building positive behaviors.

A regular school year, as well as a five-week summer program, is provided by the Special School District of St. Louis County. Teaching staff is specially trained to deal with adolescents who have learning and behavior problems. A registered nurse and visiting doctor/nurse practitioner provides medical care to residents. Students receive Title I services during the regular school year.
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2. Describe the formal agreement between the LEA and correctional facilities and alternative school programs serving youth involved with the juvenile justice system to operate programs for delinquent youth. (See Appendix A)

Special School District of St. Louis County was charged by law (Senate Bill 466-School District Responsibility for County and Court Juvenile Placements) to provide to all children in judicial custody in St. Louis County with academic instruction. This mandate included both the Juvenile Detention Center in Clayton, Missouri; Lakeside Treatment Center in St. Louis County, Missouri; and Shelter Care, St. Louis County.

3. As appropriate, describe how participating schools will coordinate with facilities working with delinquent youth to ensure that youth are participating in an education program comparable to the education program operated by the LEA.

Teachers of the Special School District of St. Louis County staff the educational program at Juvenile Detention Center.

The Special School District program is designed to meet the individual needs of students in both academic and behavioral areas of development. Education is considered a vital part of the overall treatment program. Teachers are certified in Special Education and/or content areas of instruction such as English/Reading, Math, Social Studies, Art, Science, Social Skills, Anger Control Management, Character Education, Physical Education, Career/Transition, and Health. Students are tested upon entry into the academic setting and then placed in an appropriate group with students of similar needs. Every effort is made to provide instruction so that the students will not regress during the absence from his/her regular component district.

An alternate educational setting is offered on the living unit for students who cannot adapt to the larger school setting.

Contributions to the development of self-discipline include: individual monitoring of behavioral growth; daily performance feedback to unit leaders; academic programming; individual and group reinforcement systems; student-teacher relationships; quarterly report cards and monthly progress reports to unit leaders, DJO's, and parents; and an organized, attractive, physical environment.

The Title I and English teachers facilitate a Book Club for the students. The book selection comes from the discarded RIF books left behind in the units by the students. The teachers and students meet for 30 minutes at a time to discuss the books following a specified format. This is a voluntary program for the students.

The Title I teacher is a member of the SSD staff and provides instruction in reading and language arts. The Title I program also provides instructional materials to students and staff. The Title I teacher collaborates with the English teacher by coordinating lesson themes. Ferguson-Floissant Frameworks curriculum is used as well as the “Show-Me” standards for Communication Arts. Instruction is provided by utilizing a collaborative model in English classes, as well as individualized tutoring. Students use the Accelerated Reader program as part of their instructional program. Title I reading and writing instruction enhances JDC's overall educational program. The majority of students receive more than 100 minutes of Title I instruction weekly. All students at JDC are eligible for Title I services.

In addition, the Title I teacher collaborates with Luxor, an outside agency which provides weekly tutoring in communication arts and mathematics.
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4. As appropriate, describe the dropout prevention program operated by participating schools and the types of services schools will provide to at-risk youth and youth transitioning from correctional facilities.

The Project LEARN Program is accredited through the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The purpose of the program is to serve Court involved juveniles who are having problems at school. Juveniles who are suspended or otherwise separated from school attend the classroom component of the program. Staff also provides educational advocacy, consultative, and assessment services. Students receive three hours of classroom instruction daily that includes two hours of academic instruction and one hour of affective education. The affective curriculum includes training in social skills and anger control, multicultural sensitivity, substance abuse education, career exploration, and transition/vocational skills.

The GED/ABE Program stands for General Equivalency Diploma/Adult Basic Education and provides academic instruction to Court involved youth who have dropped out of school. This instruction is designed to help these youth pass the GED exam and/or improve their academic skills.

Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) provides career exploration and job readiness training to older juveniles who need help with planning for their long and short-term vocational futures.

All students in the Court’s GED and Project LEARN programs participate in four weeks of group activities designed to help them think about planning for careers and jobs. Other Court involved juveniles may receive individual YOU services upon request.

5. As appropriate, describe the youth expected to be served by the dropout prevention program and how the school will be coordinating existing educational programs to meet unique education needs which may include vocational education, special education, career counseling and assistance in securing student loans or grants.

Juvenile Detention Center students are juveniles who are alleged to have committed a law violation and are detained if it is believed that they present a threat to themselves or the community. They remain in Detention until the Court hears their case or until the appropriate alternative arrangements have been made. Students are under the age of 21. Special School District is responsible for the on-site school as well as all special education services for St. Louis County. Coordination of special services is done “in house”. All special education requirements are integrated into the student’s academic schedule. Career counseling and exploration are incorporated into the academic schedule. All students at JDC are eligible for Title I services. The Title I program helps to increase interest in reading; assist in developing an appropriate, challenging communication arts curriculum; and improve students’ reading and writing skills through individual tutoring.

Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) is a career orientation, career counseling and pre-vocational skills programs. Students in the Court’s GED and Project L.E.A.R.N. programs participate in three to four weeks of daily group activities designed to help them begin thinking about careers and steps involved in pursuing careers of interest to them. In addition, students learn job finding and keeping skills. The Title I program reinforces these career skills through oral and written communication and reading activities.
6. As appropriate, describe how schools will coordinate with existing social and health services to meet the needs of students at-risk of dropping out of school and other participating students, including prenatal health care and nutrition services related to the health of the parent and child, parenting and child development classes, child care, targeted reentry and outreach programs, referrals to community resources, and scheduling flexibility. Funds may be used for the coordination of health and social services for these students if there is a likelihood that the provision of services, including day care and drug and alcohol counseling, will improve the likelihood that youth will complete their education.

The Social Skill Empowerment Program’s objectives are to teach: basic communication skills, how to identify emotions in self and others, fundamentals of problem solving skills, and basic anger management and conflict resolution skills. The program uses lecture, large and small group discussion groups, role-plays, brainstorming, self-disclosure, and other experiential activities to teach the curriculum. The activities focus on examining their values, goals and choices through structured activities. Participants are taught to see how their current behaviors are affecting their lives, either positively or negatively, and how those behaviors can be encouraged or modified.

All residents in the Detention Center participate in individual and group counseling which is designed to meet each resident’s need. Individualized screening using the Massachusetts Assessment Youth Screening Instrument within 24 hours of arrival at JDC is used to indicate and address students with specific mental health needs. Services are provided by court personnel and community resources.

Health screenings and health curriculum are provided by the Special School District in the school setting. No Title I funds are used to provide health services to residents.

7. As appropriate, describe any partnership with local businesses to develop training and mentoring services for participating students.

Luxor Learning Inc., a volunteer one-to-one tutoring program in collaboration with family court, SSD and Title I, provides services for JDC students. Luxor Learning is dedicated to the renewing of urban youth through on-going learning techniques, deploying computer skills, reading, math, and English.

Church Women United, on a weekly basis, provide Reading is Fundamental (RIF) books for all residents. In addition, RIF volunteers read to each group of students to whet students’ appetites for reading.

The objectives Project Character are to provide detention residents with positive role models and to create awareness among volunteers of the need for community involvement with detained youth. Volunteers have the option of working with individuals or groups in various areas of the Center. The expectation is that the volunteers will find their own niche and be a resourceful person. Examples of interaction may include talking, playing games or cards, tutoring, working with the computer, and playing sports.

Special grant monies received from the State Division of Youth Services allowed the Court to hire two full-time Mentor Program Specialists responsible for expanding the Mentor Program both internally and into the community. What makes the mentor/mentee relationship so important is that the mentor acts as a friend, advocate, and role model, and not just another authority figure. Through support from the Mentor Program staff, the mentor is able to address a variety of problems by customizing the relationship to the needs of individual youth.

During the summer, after the conclusion of regular summer school, the CARE (Community Assisted Resident Education Program) takes place. Business and community organizations provide educational components that develop life, vocational skills, and provide a link to the community. Collaboration takes place between the Family Court community and business to help students make the transition back into the community.
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8. As appropriate, describe how the program will involve parents in efforts to improve the educational achievement of their children, assist in dropout prevention activities, and prevent the involvement of their children in delinquent activities.

The Parent Group meets for 2 hours for seven consecutive weeks. Group size does not exceed 15 adults. The curriculum addresses parenting styles, effective discipline, natural and logical consequences, negotiating mutual agreements and setting and enforcing limits. Parents need to attend regularly since each session builds on information learned at the previous one. Parents who have not attended by the third session are dropped from the group, but can re-enroll in a subsequent group. Attendance reports with comments as needed are sent weekly to Juvenile Detention Officers.

Family Therapy through the Family and Clinical Services Unit offers assessment. Recommendations are made as to need and type of therapy. If therapy by family & Clinical Services is recommended, sessions of approximately one-hour duration are scheduled with the assigned family therapist for treatment. The general approach is identification and modification of pattern of interaction among family members that may be related to the juvenile behavior problems. The Title I teacher does not have direct contact with parents. DJO’s handle information going from the school/Title I program to the parent.

9. Describe how the program will be coordinated with other federal, state, and local programs, such as programs under the Job Training and Partnership Act and vocational education programs serving this at-risk population of youth.

The Care Program offers a workplace readiness component during the summer to each unit.

Special School District of St. Louis County also operates North Technical High School, South Technical High School, and the Career/Transition Program. If a Juvenile Detention Center student indicates an interest and it is an appropriate avenue for that student after a full semester at their home school district, the student may apply at one of the two schools per vocational interest or the Career/Transition Program.

The Career/Transition Program operates at numerous job sights in the St. Louis Metropolitan area that provides all day on-the-job training and functional curriculum for participants in industrial-based programs.
The Title I reading teacher works collaboratively with the English teacher. The GED curriculum and life skills are utilized with students to improve their reading and writing skills. The students learn to become more proficient in such activities as filling out job applications, reading want ads to find jobs, learning salary and job requirements and dress appropriateness. Character Education is supported/reinforced through literature.

The Title I program enhances the Detention Center Court Mentor Program, Project LEARN, and the Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) Program.

Tutorial reading instruction by the Title I teacher takes place on an as needed basis.

As appropriate, describe how schools will work with probation officers to assist in meeting the needs of youth returning from correctional facilities.

The Deputy Juvenile Officers are responsible for following up on student activity, including academic progress. When students leave the Center, any transcripts, report cards, progress reports, student discipline records as per the Safe Schools Act or applicable information is passed on to the component districts, GED program or other residential setting to insure no holes in the students' scholastic program occur.

If a student transfers to Lakeside Center, the Court ordered residential treatment facility, or a Special School District building, it is particularly easy to transfer academic information swiftly because it can be done “in house”. Special School District Title I Programs operate at Lakeside Center and all but one of the Special School District Schools. Title I testing information and materials are available to the student's receiving schools within Special School District.

Deputy Juvenile Officers (DJO's) receive copies of student report cards and progress reports. Also available to DJO's upon request are transcripts and student discipline reports as per the Safe Schools Act.
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12. Describe efforts participating schools will make to ensure correctional facilities working with youth are aware of a child’s existing individualized education program.

Educational services within the Juvenile Detention Center are provided by the Special School District of St. Louis County. All special education services for the 23 partner school districts of St. Louis County are provided by Special School District. Therefore, teachers have immediate access to all special education requirements/Individual Education Plans and can start implementation as soon as a student enters the Center. Students who are suspected of having a disability can be referred to the Special School District diagnostic teams for intake evaluation.

Title I teacher completes a Multiple Criteria Sheet that identifies students with IEP’s. Modifications/accommodations are made as needed. The Title I teacher completes a rating checklist on each student upon entering and exiting school. This gives a pre-rating and post-rating measure of skills.

13. As appropriate, describe the steps participating schools will take to find alternative placements for youth interested in continuing their education but unable to participate in a regular public school program.

A court hearing determines a student’s future placement. If transitioning into a student’s home district regular programming is not an option, he/she may be placed in the partner district’s alternative school or Special School District schools/Bridges program.

The Liaison Educational Advocacy Resource Network is a diagnostic educational program involved with the Family Court of St. Louis County. Students attend a self-contained classroom for three hours daily, Monday through Thursday and two hours on Friday, generally for eight to twelve weeks. Small teacher-student ratio and individual learning plans along with effective curriculum are featured. Subsequently, a Final Education Report consisting of grades, behaviors and attendance is sent to the DJO and home school. Hopefully, an easier transition will occur. Follow-up on students is completed through the Deputy Juvenile Officers, parents, home schoolteachers and/or counselors.

The GED/ABE Program provides academic instruction to Court-involved youth that have dropped out of school. The Deputy Juvenile Officers makes referrals. The GED exam is taken at Harris-Stowe State College.

All students in the Courts GED and Project LEARN complete the Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) group curriculum. As needed, YOU staff help Court-involved youth pursue their employment and career goals. This may involve YOU staff directing students through college, vocational school, financial aid, and job application processes.
# APPENDIX A
## PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Correctional facilities serving neglected, delinquent, or at-risk children may receive Title I funding if they enter into an agreement with the LEA and describe the following:

1. where feasible, ensure educational programs in juvenile facilities are coordinated with the student’s home school particularly with respect to special education students with an individualized education program.

2. notify the local school of youth identified as needing special education services while in the facility.

3. where feasible, provide transition assistance to help the youth to reenter or stay in school, including coordination of services for the family, counseling, assistance in accessing drug and alcohol abuse prevention programs, tutoring, and family counseling.

4. provide support programs which encourage youth who have dropped out to reenter school once their term has been completed or provide youth with the skills necessary to gain employment or seek a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

5. work to ensure facilities are staffed with teachers and other qualified staff who are trained to work with children with disabilities and/or special needs.

6. ensure educational programs in correctional facilities are related to assisting students to meet high educational standards.

7. use, to the extent possible, technology to assist in coordinating educational programs between the juvenile facility and the community school.

8. where feasible, involve parents in efforts to improve the educational achievement of their children and prevent the further involvement of the youth in delinquent activities.

9. coordinate Title I funds with other local, State, and Federal funds available to provide services to participating youth, such as funds under the Job Training Partnership Act, and vocational education funds.

10. coordinate programs with activities funded under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and other comparable programs, if applicable.

11. if appropriate, work with local businesses to develop training and mentoring programs for participating youth.

Refer to: Federal Neglected & Delinquent Guidance pages 21-22

## FOR DESE USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVAL SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MO 500-2081 (4-03)
APPENDIX 2-3
**SECTION 1 - NAME AND LOCATION OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
<th>ADDRESS OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Center</td>
<td>13044 Marine Avenue</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>(314) 434-4535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAME OF PRINCIPAL OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION**

William A. Wolff – Director of Lakeside Center

**SECTION II - CONSULTATION WITH DELINQUENT INSTITUTION**

1. NAME OF PERSONS REPRESENTING THE SCHOOLS IN SUCH CONSULTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTING THE PUBLIC SCHOOL</th>
<th>REPRESENTING THE DELINQUENT INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Kulp, Federal Programs Coordinator</td>
<td>William Wolff, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Ivol, Principal, Lakeside Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. GIVE DATES OF MEETINGS AND CONSULTATIONS HELD FOR PURPOSES OF COLLECTING BASIC DATA AND PLANNING THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DESCRIBED IN THIS DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/1/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION III - PARTICIPATION OF DELINQUENT INSTITUTION AND ASSURANCES**

1. ☑ THIS DELINQUENT INSTITUTION DOES WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES.

2. ☐ THIS DELINQUENT INSTITUTION DOES NOT WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN TITLE I ACTIVITIES

**ASSURANCES**

THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY ASSURES THE CHIEF STATE OFFICER AND THE LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL THAT:

B. ALL THE REQUIREMENTS SET FOURTH BY THE FEDERAL STATUTE AND ACCOMPANYING REGULATIONS AND RULES FOR DELINQUENT PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I, ESEA WILL BE SATISFACTORILY MET.

**SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL OR OTHER REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DELINQUENT INSTITUTION**

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOL**

MO 500-2081 (4-03)
SPECIAL RULE

An LEA which includes a correctional facility that operates a school is not required to operate a dropout prevention program if more than 30% of the youth attending the facility will reside outside the boundaries of the local educational agency upon leaving the facility.

PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE DELINQUENT, OR AT-RISK OF DROPPING OUT

The LEA in which an eligible delinquent institution is located, and which desires assistance to operate prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk of dropping out shall:

1. Describe the program to be assisted with Title I funds.

Lakeside Center is a St. Louis County residential treatment facility for delinquent, emotionally disturbed, neglected, and abused children residing in St. Louis County. Lakeside Center, located on a twenty-five acre campus, provides treatment in a therapeutic setting to troubled youngsters ages 12 through 18 who cannot be treated effectively in their own environment. Each youth accepted at Lakeside is offered a specialized program combining a team approach of the staff and the use of appropriate community resources. Program emphasis is placed on teaching troubled youth to learn to make responsible decisions and lead productive lives. Through the provision of emergency shelter, residential treatment, residential substance abuse treatment, and transitional living services, the goal is to help these youth gain control of their interpersonal lives in order to handle family and community pressures in a socially acceptable manner and to divert them from homelessness and incarceration as adults.

Services offered include individual counseling, group therapy, family therapy, psychiatric consultations, chemical dependency treatment and a parent education program. Teachers of Special School District of St. Louis County staff the education program at Lakeside Center. Youth are offered employment preparation through work-study programs and a variety of positive recreational activities are available.

The Special School District provides a regular school year as well as a five-week extended year summer program. The five-week summer school is augmented by the APS/Transition program to further enhance students’ vocational/transition experience through the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) run by the Urban League of St. Louis. Teaching staff is specially trained to deal with the adolescents who have learning and behavioral problems, in addition to being certified in their particular area. Students receive Title I services from a Title I Reading Specialist with Reading Specialist K-12 certification during the regular school year.
SECTION IV. PROGRAM PLAN

2. Describe the formal agreement between the LEA and correctional facilities and alternative school programs serving youth involved with the juvenile justice system to operate programs for delinquent youth. (See Appendix A)

Special School District of St. Louis County was charged by law (Senate Bill 466-School District Responsibility for County or Court Juvenile Placements) to provide all children in judicial custody in St. Louis County with academic instruction. This mandate included both the Juvenile Detention Center in Clayton, Missouri and Lakeside Treatment Center in St. Louis County, Missouri.

3. As appropriate, describe how participating schools will coordinate with facilities working with delinquent youth to ensure that youth are participating in an education program comparable to the education program operated by the LEA.

Teachers of the Special School District of St. Louis County staff the educational program at Lakeside.

The program is designed to meet the individual needs of students in both the academic and behavioral areas of development. Education is considered a vital part of the overall treatment program. Teachers are certified in Special Education and/or the content areas of instruction such as English, Math, Social Studies, Science, Physical Education, Health, Developmental Reading, GED Instruction, and Home Economics. This certification enables students to earn credits transferable to other districts.

Individual tracking of behavioral growth, daily performance feedback to cottages, academic programming, individual and group reinforcement systems, student-teacher relationships, report cards, transcripts, and student discipline records as per Safe School Act are provided to component districts, cottage staff, Division of Family Services and Deputy Juvenile Officer. The creation of an organized, attractive physical environment contributes to student self-discipline. Students may be recommended for out-of-agency schooling in the Parkway School District, Pattonville School District, vocational program, Transition Program, vocational technical program, or Bridges program.

Title I is an integral part of the Lakeside educational program. It includes the following four key components. The Accelerated Reader (AR) program addresses the reading needs of Lakeside students. It provides motivation and recognition for reading achievement. Sustained silent reading is scheduled daily. Collaboration with the English classes supports overall literacy development for all students, including provision of materials, mini-lessons, study skills, meaningful writing activities and computer-aided instruction. Individual reading programs are provided in a one-to-one or small group setting, incorporating explicit, systematic instruction and ongoing assessment. The overall curriculum at Lakeside follows the Ferguson-Florissant School District’s frameworks and aligns with the Show-Me Standards. In keeping with those frameworks, Lakeside creates safe, nurturing environments that challenge students, honor diversity and encourage students to respect cultural, racial, and ethnic language differences. All students’ needs are addressed through a variety of grouping strategies and differentiated instruction.
4. As appropriate, describe the dropout prevention program operated by participating schools and the types of services schools will provide to at-risk youth and youth transitioning from correctional facilities.

The educational program is geared to meet individual needs. “Learning gaps” are addressed so that students are prepared to reenter their home district at a higher academic level. In addition to the emphasis on skill development in English, Developmental Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies, students receive instruction and direction in the area of career development, GED, social skills training, anger management, and character education.

In order for a youth to be released from Lakeside Center, a complete plan must be in place that addresses his/her academic, mental and social needs. The caseworker closely monitors student progress after the child leaves the confines of Lakeside Center until the court deems the student has integrated well into his/her planned program.

The Title I Program at Lakeside addresses individual needs and provides strategies for success in the areas of reading and writing. The Title I teacher focuses on addressing literacy needs to support the transition process. The transition program at Lakeside targets students ages 12-18 years old who are at risk.

5. As appropriate, describe the youth expected to be served by the dropout prevention program and how the school will be coordinating existing educational programs to meet unique education needs which may include vocational education, special education, career counseling and assistance in securing student loans or grants.

Lakeside Center students are those that have been judged delinquent by Family Court. They have serious needs, are many times dysfunctional, and have delinquent records or have committed unlawful behavior. They have been judged by the Court to be taken out of the local community. Most students are between 12 and 18 years of age. Special School District of St. Louis County is responsible for the on-site school and all educational needs except for those who are re-integrating into regular school. Students continue academic progress as soon as they enter Lakeside. All special education requirements are integrated into the student’s academic schedule. Career counseling and exploration are incorporated into the academic schooldays. During placement, students who can handle the academic and behavioral demands of regular public schooling may spend all or part of their school day at the Parkway or Pattonville Districts.

The Title I Program augments the Transition Program by focusing on the literacy needs of students for successful transition into adulthood.
TITLE I, PART D, DELINQUENT INSTITUTION PROGRAM PLAN

SECTION IV - PROGRAM PLAN

6. As appropriate, describe how schools will coordinate with existing social and health services to meet the needs of students at-risk of dropping out of school and other participating students, including prenatal health care and nutrition services related to the health of the parent and child, parenting and child development classes, child care, targeted reentry and outreach programs, referrals to community resources, and scheduling flexibility. Funds may be used for the coordination of health and social services for these students if there is a likelihood that the provision of services, including day care and drug and alcohol counseling, will improve the likelihood that youth will complete their education.

Students receive comprehensive aftercare planning and follow-up services in their local communities through Youth Wrap (at least until December 2004), a federal grant funded by the Department of Labor.

A nurse practitioner and a pediatrician on a regular part-time basis provide for the health care needs of all residents. The pediatrician also provides on-call medical guidance. Parents sign a medical release form at admissions time, which permits Lakeside Center to attend to emergency needs. All children placed at Lakeside are eligible for Medicaid.

The Specialized Treatment Services Unit at Lakeside provides individual therapy, family therapy, crisis counseling, substance abuse assessment and specialized group treatment for such problems as drug abuse and anger management. Services are accessed by referral from a child’s cottage manager. The staff in this unit is specifically licensed to provide clinical treatment services.

Lakeside employs the services of a child psychiatrist on a part-time basis for treatment consultation on selected cases, monitoring of residents receiving psychotropic medications, and for periodic in-service training. Psychological evaluations are secured via referral to a licensed clinical psychologist retained part-time by Lakeside as a consultant, or to the Clinical Services Unit of the Family Court of St. Louis County.

No Title I funds are used for the coordination of health and social services for Lakeside students.

7. As appropriate, describe any partnership with local businesses to develop training and mentoring services for participating students.

“The Friends of Lakeside” is a non-profit group of concerned St. Louis County citizens that solicits and disburses funds for specific activities such as therapeutic camps, recreation equipment, musical instruments, etc. The Following civic organizations have maintained an ongoing interest and support for Lakeside’s Programs: Lions Club, Kiwanis, Rotary, Optimists, Seven Pines Association, AMVETS, and the Maryland Heights Chamber of Commerce.

Many of the fast food restaurants, such as Arby’s, McDonald’s, Wendy’s, and Steak and Shake work with and employ some Lakeside Center students. Some students may be in Transition Service or Community Access Based Programs provided by SSD.

The Community Access Based Programs offer an opportunity for transition from school to work and provides an option for students who can benefit from paid work experience. Program sites include: Children’s Hospital, DePaul Health Center, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Veteran’s Administration Medical Center-Jefferson Barracks, Veteran’s Administration Medical Center-John Cochran and Village North/Christian Hospital Northeast.

Lakeside provides a mentoring program for female students and is a satellite site for the St. Louis County Family Court Mentoring Program.

There will be collaboration between Title I and the Episcopal City Mission that provides chaplainry services to Lakeside students. The EMC through one of its sponsoring churches will provide RIF books to all Lakeside students throughout the year. The RIF program will be coordinated with the Title I Accelerated Reader program. The Title I teacher will be on the RIF book selection committee.
SECTION IV - PROGRAM PLAN

8. As appropriate, describe how the program will involve parents in efforts to improve the educational achievement of their children, assist in dropout prevention activities, and prevent the involvement of their children in delinquent activities.

Lakeside Center strongly values and encourages parental involvement in the treatment program. Parents/families are engaged in a variety of ways to address their needs and promote a youth’s successful return home. The Cottage Manager and designated Adolescent Care Specialist maintain an ongoing contact with the youth’s parent(s) throughout the course of placement concerning his/her progress in treatment and to process home visitation. Parents may be referred to the Specialized Services Department for family therapy by a trained family therapist. There are periodic parent group meetings designed to address such key parental concerns as drug/alcohol abuse, discipline, communication skills, and self-esteem and conflict resolution. Parents are asked to work with Lakeside school personnel in developing a realistic education plan for their children. Parents are encouraged to attend social functions over the course of the year to enhance normal parent/child relationships, such as open houses in the fall and spring and annual awards banquet.

Title I participates in parent involvement activities, such as reading workshops, BBQ, Open House, and Workshop Options. Students who excel are rewarded for their efforts. The reading program is not limited to school. The entire Lakeside teaching, therapeutic, and cottage staff encourage reading.

9. Describe how the program will be coordinated with other federal, state, and local programs, such as programs under the Job Training and Partnership Act and vocational education programs serving this at-risk population of youth.

Special School District of St. Louis County also operates North Technical High School, South Technical High School, and Transition Programs. Students can apply for technical school placement while a resident at Lakeside, but must complete one semester in their home school before entering the technical school. Students can also access the Job Corps/Independent Living program, as well as the Family Courts’ Project L.E.A.R.N. and GED programs.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>Describe how the program will be coordinated with programs operated under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and other comparable programs if applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.</th>
<th>As appropriate, describe how schools will work with probation officers to assist in meeting the needs of youth returning from correctional facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three juvenile probation officers are assigned to Lakeside Center specifically to monitor and evaluate all students in the agency including their academic program. These probation officers follow the student progress in transition to the student’s original component district. Report cards, behavior, transcripts, social interactions and discipline records as per the Safe Schools Act, are checked with original homeroom teachers, guidance counselors, and other pertinent original component district staff. Title I teacher provides input/information to the SSD caseload teacher who in turn reports to the DJO’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MO 500-2081 (4-03)
The Special School District of St. Louis County provides educational services, on the grounds. All special education services for the 23 school districts of St. Louis County are provided by Special School District. Therefore, teachers have immediate access to all student special education requirements such as Individual Educational Plans and evaluations/reevaluations, and can start implementation as soon as the student enters the Center. A Special School District evaluation team in collaboration with classroom teachers completes routine reevaluations with classroom teachers. Students who are suspected of having a disability can be referred for an intake evaluation.

Title I teacher completes a multiple criteria sheet, which identifies the handicapping condition if one exists. Instruction is modified when necessary.

All students must have a complete plan that addresses academic, behavioral, mental and social needs. If transitioning into the student’s home district regular programming is not an option, he/she may be placed in the SSD’s special education program, Family Court Project L.E.A.R.N. and GED programs, Bridges program, or alternative school. Component districts may also offer alternative school or GED programs. If a student transitions into another Special School District facility that offers Title I service, the student will continue in the Title I program if that student meets the eligibility requirements. Special School District offers a variety of schools-to-work programs through the Transition Services Department. The Community Based Program offers job exploration through volunteer work training as well as functional classroom instruction.
APPENDIX A

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Correctional facilities serving neglected, delinquent, or at-risk children may receive Title I funding if they enter into an agreement with the LEA and describe the following:

1. where feasible, ensure educational programs in juvenile facilities are coordinated with the student's home school particularly with respect to special education students with an individualized education program.

2. notify the local school of youth identified as needing special education services while in the facility.

3. where feasible, provide transition assistance to help the youth to reenter or stay in school, including coordination of services for the family, counseling, assistance in accessing drug and alcohol abuse prevention programs, tutoring, and family counseling.

4. provide support programs which encourage youth who have dropped out to reenter school once their term has been completed or provide youth with the skills necessary to gain employment or seek a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

5. work to ensure facilities are staffed with teachers and other qualified staff who are trained to work with children with disabilities and/or special needs.

6. ensure educational programs in correctional facilities are related to assisting students to meet high educational standards.

7. use, to the extent possible, technology to assist in coordinating educational programs between the juvenile facility and the community school.

8. where feasible, involve parents in efforts to improve the educational achievement of their children and prevent the further involvement of the youth in delinquent activities.

9. coordinate Title I funds with other local, State, and Federal funds available to provide services to participating youth, such as funds under the Job Training Partnership Act, and vocational education funds.

10. coordinate programs with activities funded under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and other comparable programs, if applicable.

11. if appropriate, work with local businesses to develop training and mentoring programs for participating youth.

Refer to: Federal Neglected & Delinquent Guidance pages 21-22
The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires a school district to select and develop its program or activities based on the Principles of Effectiveness for Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 1: Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Principle 2: Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A school district shall base its program on an assessment of objective data regarding the incidence of violence, serious discipline problems, and illegal drug use in the schools and communities served.</td>
<td>A school district shall base its program on performance measures aimed at ensuring the schools and communities have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 3: Scientifically Based Research</th>
<th>Principle 4: Analysis of the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A school district's program and activities shall be based on scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program to be used will reduce violence and illegal drug use.</td>
<td>A school district shall review an analysis of the data on the prevalence of risk factors, including reported cases of child abuse and domestic violence, and of protective factors, and other variables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 5: Consultation with Parents</th>
<th>Principle 6: Program Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A school district shall develop its application and administer its program or activities following meaningful and ongoing consultation with, and input from, parents.</td>
<td>A school district shall evaluate its program to assess progress towards reducing violence and illegal drug use in schools served, based on performance measures, and results shall be used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program, and shall be made available to the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Allowable Uses of Consolidated Federal Programs Funds

The Federal Programs Administrative Manual published in January of 2005 lists the allowable uses of funds for the Title programs with the exception of Title I.A. The information below is taken directly from the administrative manual. The items in bold-faced type indicate how SSD uses the resources from the respective grants.

Title I.D Allowable Uses:
The Title I.D allocation must be used only for prevention and intervention programs to serve youth who are delinquent or at risk of dropping out of school. These funds may be used in any of the following ways:

• programs to transition children and youth returning to public schools from delinquent facilities to help them remain in school and complete their education
• dropout prevention programs for at-risk youth, including pregnant and parenting teens, children and youth who have come in contact with the juvenile justice system, children and youth at least one year behind their expected grade level, migrant and immigrant youth, students with limited English proficiency, and gang members
• coordination of health and social services, such as day care, alcohol and other drug counseling, and mental health services, if needed, to allow these students to complete their education
• special programs to meet the unique academic needs of participating children and youth, including vocational and technical education, special education, career counseling, curriculum-based youth entrepreneurship education, and assistance in securing student loans or grants for postsecondary education
• programs providing mentoring and peer mediation.

Title II.A Allowable Uses:
Because in Title II.A, NCLB combined the purposes of the former Title II and Class-Size Reduction, II.A funds may be used for both high quality professional development and the hiring of supplemental highly qualified teachers, especially class-size reduction teachers.

Allowable uses are as follows:

• Professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals in the core areas of English, reading or communication arts, science, math, fine arts, foreign language, civics, government, economics, arts, history, and geography.
• Professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals in effective instructional strategies, methods, and skills, including but not limited to the following topics: collaborative teaching, alternative learning styles, improving
student behavior, early intervention strategies, parent involvement strategies, use of
data to drive instruction, technology integration, and team teaching strategies.

• Training in how to address the needs of students with disabilities, students with
special learning needs (including gifted and talented), and students with limited
English proficiency.

• Professional development for principals and superintendents in educational
leadership skills.

• Initiatives to promote retention of highly qualified teachers and principals through
mentoring by exemplary staff and support during their first three years of employment.

• Hiring highly qualified regular and special education teachers to reduce class size,
especially in the early grades.

• Hiring highly qualified regular and special education teachers who are in addition to
district funded staff.

• Recruiting highly qualified teacher and principals (such as participation in job fairs or
development of promotional materials).

• Recruiting minorities, individuals with disabilities and others from under represented
groups.

Title II.D Allowable Uses:
In addition to the required professional development, the following uses are allowable
with Title II.D funds:

• Additional professional development in effectively integrating technology in
classroom instruction

• Purchase of technology to enable teachers to increase student academic achievement,
including technology literacy and utilization of distance learning strategies not
otherwise available

• Development of public-private partnerships designed to increase access to technology
for students and teachers, with special emphasis on the access of technology for high-
need schools

• Developing or acquiring technology or effective curricula that include integrated
technology designed to help students meet State academic achievement standards

• Using technology to connect schools and teachers with parents and students to
promote meaningful parental involvement; to foster increased communication about
curricula, assignments, and assessments; and to assist parents to understand the
technology used in their child’s education so that parents are able to reinforce at home
the instruction received at school

• Preparing and paying teachers in elementary and secondary schools as technology
leaders who can serve as experts and train other teachers in the effective use of
technology
• Acquiring connectivity linkages, resources, and services for use by school staff to improve student academic achievement
• Using technology to collect, manage, and analyze data to inform and enhance teaching and school improvement efforts
• Evaluating the effectiveness of education technology programs funded under Title II.D, especially the integration of technology in the curriculum and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach, and enabling students to meet State academic achievement standards
• Developing, enhancing, or implementing information technology courses.

Title IV.A Allowable Uses:
A district may use Title IV.A funds to carry out activities that comply with the principles of effectiveness, such as the following:
A. Age appropriate and developmentally based activities that address the consequences of violence and the illegal use of drugs, as appropriate; promote a sense of individual responsibility; teach students that most people do not illegally use drugs; teach students to recognize social and peer pressure to use drugs illegally and the skills for resisting illegal drug use; teach students about the dangers of emerging drugs; engage students in the learning process; and incorporate activities in secondary schools that reinforce prevention activities implemented in elementary schools.
B. Activities that involve families, community sectors, and a variety of drug and violence prevention providers in setting clear expectations against violence and illegal use of drugs and appropriate consequences for such behavior.
C. Dissemination of drug and violence prevention information to schools and the community.
D. Professional development and training for, and involvement of, school personnel, pupil services personnel, parents, and interested community members in prevention, education, early identification and intervention, mentoring, or rehabilitation referral, as related to drug and violence prevention.
E. Drug and violence prevention activities that may include the following:
1. Community-wide planning and organizing activities to reduce violence and illegal drug use, which may include gang activity prevention.
2. Acquiring and installing metal detectors, electronic locks, surveillance cameras, or other related equipment and technologies.
3. Reporting criminal offenses committed on school property.
4. Developing and implementing comprehensive school security plans or obtaining technical assistance concerning such plans, which may include obtaining a security assessment or assistance from the School Security and Technology Resource Center at the Sandia National Laboratory located in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

5. Supporting safe zones of passage activities that ensure that students travel safely to and from school, which may include bicycle and pedestrian safety programs.

6. The hiring and mandatory training based on scientific research, of school security personnel (including school resource officers) who interact with students in support of youth drug and violence prevention activities that are implemented in the school.

7. Expanded and improved school-based mental health services related to illegal drug use and violence, including early identification of violence and illegal drug use, assessment, and direct or group counseling services provided to students, parents, families, and school personnel by qualified school-based mental health service providers.

8. Conflict resolution programs, including peer mediation programs that educate and train peer mediators and a designated faculty supervisor, and youth anti-crime and anti-drug councils and activities.

9. Alternative education programs or services for violent or drug abusing students that reduce the need for suspension or expulsion or that serve students who have been suspended or expelled from the regular educational settings, including programs or services to assist students to make continued progress toward meeting the State academic achievement standards and to reenter the regular education setting.

10. Counseling, mentoring, referral services, and other student assistance practices and programs, including assistance provided by qualified school-based mental health services providers and the training of teachers by school-based mental health services providers in appropriate identification and intervention techniques for students at risk of violent behavior and illegal use of drugs.

11. Programs that encourage students to seek advice from, and to confide in, a trusted adult regarding concerns about violence and illegal drug use.

12. Drug and violence prevention activities designed to prevent truancy.

13. Age-appropriate, developmentally-based violence prevention and education programs that address victimization associated with prejudice and intolerance, and that include activities designed to help students develop a sense of individual responsibility and respect for the rights of others, and to resolve conflicts without violence.

14. Consistent with the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the testing of a student for illegal drug use or the inspecting of a student’s locker for weapons or illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia, including at the request of or with the consent of a parent or legal guardian of the student.
15. Emergency intervention services following traumatic crisis events, such as a shooting, major accident, or a drug-related incident, that have disrupted the learning environment.

16. Establishing or implementing a system for transferring suspension and expulsion records, consistent with the General Education Provisions Act, by a district to any public or nonpublic elementary or secondary school.

17. Developing and implementing character education programs, as a component of drug and violence prevention programs, that take into account the views of students and the parents of the students for whom the program is intended.

18. Establishing and maintaining a school safety hotline.

19. Community service, including community service performed by expelled students, and service-learning projects.

20. Conducting a nationwide background check of each district employee, regardless of when hired, and prospective employees for the purpose of determining whether they have been convicted of a crime that bears upon their fitness to be responsible for the safety or well being of children, to serve in the particular capacity in which they are or will be employed.

21. Responding to the needs of students who are faced with domestic violence or child abuse.

22. Programs to train school personnel to identify warning signs of youth suicide and to create an action plan to help youth at risk of suicide.

8. F. The evaluation of any authorized activities and the collection of objective data used to assess program needs, program implementation, or program success in achieving program goals and objectives.

No more than 40 percent of the Title IV funds available may be budgeted on line 6.6, school safety, on the application.

Title V Allowable Uses:
Title V innovative assistance programs must be tied to promoting challenging academic achievement standards, be used to improve student academic achievement, and be part of an overall education reform strategy. The following supplementary, innovative activities are allowable:

1. Programs and activities that expand learning opportunities through best practice models designed to improve classroom learning and teaching

2. Implementing research-based academic programs

3. Programs to recruit, train, and hire highly qualified teachers to reduce class size, especially in the early grades, and professional development activities carried out in accordance with Title II that give teachers, principals, and administrators the
knowledge and skills to help students meet challenging State and local academic content and achievement standards.

4. **Technology activities related to implementation of school-based reform efforts**, including professional development to assist school personnel (including library media personnel) in using technology effectively in the classrooms and school library media centers

5. **Development or acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials (including media center materials and services); academic assessments; reference materials; computer software and hardware for instructional use; and other curricular materials used to improve student academic achievement**

6. Promising education reform projects (related to specific goals in district's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan)

7. Programs to improve academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged students, including dropout prevention activities

8. Programs to improve literacy skills of adults, including family literacy and adult education programs, especially for parents of students served in the local educational agency

9. Programs for the educational needs of gifted and talented students

10. Support for academic assessment and improvement in Title I schools identified for School Improvement

11. Community service programs led by qualified school personnel

12. Activities to promote consumer, economic and personal finance education

13. Activities supporting public school choice

14. Hiring and supporting school nurses

15. School-based mental health services

16. Alternative educational programs for expelled or suspended students, including assistance for them to reenter the regular educational setting

17. Preschool programs

18. Joint school-community academic intervention programs, as well as counseling programs conducted during the school day, for those most at risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards or of dropping out of school

19. CPR training in schools

20. Establishment of smaller learning communities

21. Strengthening parental and community involvement

22. Service learning activities

23. **School safety programs**

24. Supplemental educational services for eligible students in schools and/or districts identified for school improvement
FEDERAL GRANTS MANAGEMENT
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
PO BOX 480, JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102
CONSOLIDATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS SELF-MONITORING CHECKLIST

2004-2005 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>County-District Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Programs Coordinator</td>
<td>Date of MSIP review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Districts scheduled for an MSIP review during the 2004-2005 school year must complete this form and send it to:
Federal Grants Management, PO Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102.
IT MUST BE POSTMARKED BY WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2004.

Directions

1. Respond to each of the following monitoring requirements by placing an appropriate code (see below) on the line to the left of the item. Responses are required on each lettered item, and documentation proving compliance must be kept on file at the district.
2. Place a checkmark in all appropriate boxes under Evidence Sources to indicate the type of supporting documentation you have available. The documentation of evidence sources must be on file at the district for possible review during MSIP. Do not send copies of evidence sources to Federal Grants Management.
3. If you have any questions, call your Grants Management Supervisor for assistance.
4. For sample forms, program guidance, and other information, see http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/fedprog/grantmgmt/

Code Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>District Compliant: A review indicates compliance. When using this code, the district must have the documentation readily available for review by Federal Grants Management, if requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>District Resolving: A review indicates a compliance discrepancy. When using this code, use the comment section to explain how the district intends to resolve the discrepancy and the intended time frame for completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>District Assistance: The district requests assistance. A supervisor from Federal Grants Management will contact the district to arrange for assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Applicable to this district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assurances

The authorized representative assures the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education that the district shall:
1. Receive and expend federal funds in a manner consistent with the intent of the approved application.
2. Keep such records for a period of three years and provide such information as may be necessary for the fiscal program auditing and for program evaluation; provide the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education any information it may need to carry out its responsibilities under the programs.
3. Adhere to the requirements of the applicable federal statutes and regulations, the state rules governing the programs, and all other applicable statutes, including: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972; Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Gun-Free Schools Certification.

The board-authorized representative understands the assurances and the responsibility for compliance placed upon the applicant. The applicant shall refund directly to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education the amount of any funds made available to the applicant that may be determined by the Department, or an Auditor representing the Department, to have been misapplied.

Authorized Representative ___________________________ Date ___________________________
1. **Complaint Procedures for Federal Programs** (see DESE's sample on the web):
   a. _____ The district routinely disseminates to parents a copy of its complaint procedures for federal programs.
   
   **Evidence Sources:**
   - Newspaper
   - Student Handbooks
   - Newsletters

2. **Nonpublic Participation** (see Administrative Manual, pp. 15 and 45-46):
   a. _____ The district conducts timely consultation with nonpublic school officials in the project planning stage for Titles I, II, A, III, and IV, A.
   
   **Evidence Source:**
   - Completed Public/Private Design for Educational Service. Required signatures are dated prior to substantial approval of the federal programs application.
   b. _____ The district expends or protects sufficient project funds for equitable services to eligible nonpublic schools.
   
   **Evidence Sources:**
   - Title I Breakdown of Allocation
   - Budgets for Titles I, II, A, III, IV, A, reflect appropriate amounts for proposed nonpublic expenditures.

3. **Obligation of Funds** (see Administrative Manual, p. 10):
   a. _____ The district provides documentation that funds are obligated (purchase orders made or services contracted) only between the time of project approval and the end of the grant period.
   b. ______ Application Approval Date for 2004-2005 School Year (see Internet Application)

   - Title I First Obligation Date
   - Title I, C Migrant Ed. First Obligation Date
   - Title II, A First Obligation Date
   - Title II, D First Obligation Date
   - Title III First Obligation Date
   - Title IV, A First Obligation Date
   - Title V First Obligation Date
   - Title VI, B Subpart 2 First Obligation Date

4. **Accounting Requirements** (see Administrative Manual, p. 12):
   a. _____ Obligations and expenditures of state and federal funds are recorded separately by program.

5. **Documentation Related to Payment of District Staff** (see Administrative Manual, p. 12):
   a. _____ The Core Data Program Code and caseloads are correct for FTEs and consistent with the application.
   b. _____ There is documentation of time for partial FTEs, including those funded through Administrative Pool.
   
   **Evidence Sources:**
   - Time and effort logs
   - Work schedules
   c. _____ For stipends and out-of-contract time paid, including Administrative Pool, the district maintains supporting records.
   
   **Evidence Sources:**
   - Workshop sign-in sheets
   - Time and effort logs
   d. _____ The district biannually certifies that all full-time staff funded from a single federal funding source or from an established funding pool (such as the administrative pool) are conducting activities consistent with the purposes of the funding source(s).
   
   **Evidence Source:**
   - Single Funding Certification form(s) completed and on file in the district.
6. **Inventory** (see Administrative Manual, p. 13):
   a. ___ A centralized inventory control system, including all required components, accounts for all equipment purchased with federal dollars.
   b. ___ Capital outlay purchases are consistent with the application.
   c. ___ District labels all inventory items purchased with federal funds (program name and date of purchase).

7. **Board-approved District Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)** (see Administrative Manual, p. 8):
   a. ___ The activities of all federal programs are reflected in the board-approved CSIP. The district indicates the source of federal funding, whether in whole or in part, as applicable, for each relevant action step.

   **Evidence Sources:**
   - Title I
   - Title I, C
   - Title II, A
   - Title II, D
   - Title III
   - Title IV, A
   - Title V
   - Title VI, B Subpart 2

8. **Reporting Requirements**
   a. ___ All items required by federal legislation are reported to the public.

   **Evidence Sources:**
   - District Report Card
   - Newspaper articles
   - Newsletters
   - Other: __________

**Comments for items indicated DR – Please include plan and time frame for resolution:**
Title I.A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged

1. LEA Plan (see Administrative Manual, p. 1)
   a. The district has an approved LEA Plan and implements activities according to the plan.
   b. The plan has been revised to indicate changes, as needed.

   Evidence Sources:
   - LEA Plan (and any revisions)
   - Notes from planning sessions addressing needs assessment and goal setting

2. Schoolwide Planning (see Administrative Manual, p. 28):
   a. Each building with a schoolwide plan implements the activities contained in the plan.
   b. Any changes have been amended into the plan.
   c. (If applicable) Schoolwide buildings with significant number of students from other language backgrounds have made the plan available to parents of such students in the parents' primary language.

3. Student Eligibility in Targeted Assistance Programs (see Administrative Manual, pp. 22-23):
   a. Student eligibility is determined by multiple, educationally-related, objective criteria. (Criteria in preschool through grade two programs must consist solely of teacher recommendation, parental interviews, developmentally appropriate measures, or other similar criteria).
   b. Master lists of eligible students are available that indicate which students have been selected to participate, the criteria used for selection, weighting of criteria, and appropriate overall cut-off score.
   c. Migrant or Limited English Proficient (LEP) children have been identified for services on the same basis as other children.

   The district conducts an annual review of the Title I-funded activities.
   a. Appropriate representation of school personnel
   b. Agenda
   c. Sign-in sheet from attendees
   d. Review of student achievement data
   e. Review of parents' evaluations
   f. Review of program strengths and weaknesses
   g. Documentation of recommendations and revisions
   h. Buildings have been notified regarding their Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status

5. Coordination (see Administrative Manual, p. 29):
   Written documentation indicates that coordination occurs between Title I staff and classroom staff through:
   a. Shared instructional objectives.
   b. One or more of the following: joint planning time, shared lesson plans, quarterly objective sheets, individual student plans, Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) or Schoolwide Plan.
   c. Evidence to demonstrate coordination among teachers in Migrant Education, LEP, Homeless, and Neglected and Delinquent services.

6. Parents Right to Know (see Companion Document, pp. 4-5)
   a. Parents of each student attending a school receiving Title I funds have been notified that they may request information regarding the professional qualifications of the student's classroom teachers.

   Evidence Sources:
   - Letters
   - Newsletters
   - Handbooks
   b. Parents have been notified when their child has been taught four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified.

7. District-Level Parent Involvement Policy (see Administrative Manual, pp. 32-33):
   a. The district has a parent involvement policy, and activities are conducted consistent with the policy.
   b. For districts with allocations over $500,000, one percent of the allocation is budgeted for parent involvement.
   Each building receiving Title I funds must have a plan for parent involvement that includes:
   a. ______ Strategies for communication
   b. ______ Descriptions of how the parent-school compact was developed and its purpose
   c. ______ Strategies for increasing opportunities for parent involvement
   d. ______ Buildings with significant numbers of students from language backgrounds other than English have made the plan available to parents of such students in the parents’ primary language.

   a. ______ The parent involvement plan and parent-school compacts are disseminated.
   b. ______ Parent meetings or workshops are held.
   c. ______ The district is using one percent of its allocation for parent involvement (if applicable, see 7. b).

   Evidence Sources:
   □ Agendas, minutes of meetings
   □ Completed sign-in forms
   □ Copies of correspondence to parents
   □ News reports, etc.
   □ Parent survey

    The district provides evidence that:
    a. ______ Proper credentials and certificates are on file with the district.
    b. ______ Caseloads as listed on class rosters are appropriate for instructional staff.
    c. ______ Teachers and paraprofessionals’ schedules reflect the number of appropriate instructional minutes for staff and students.

    The district provides evidence that each eligible building receives the allocated amount of funds and in the order indicated on the approved Breakdown of Allocation (BOA).
    a. ______ Current building-level budgets and expenditures correspond to BOA.

   Evidence Source:
   □ Bookkeeping record of related expenditures
   □ For districts with allocations over $500,000, one percent of the allocation is budgeted for parent involvement

12. Targeted Usage (see Administrative Manual, p. 36):
    Materials, equipment, and facilities funded by Title I are used according to regulations and guidelines.
    a. ______ Observations, interviews, and records of usage with staff indicate that Title I-funded materials and facilities are used only by participating students.

13. Preschool Education Programs (see Administrative Manual, p. 36):
    a. ______ District follows one of the recommended models for its Title I-funded preschool. Check model being used:
       □ Head Start Education and Early Childhood Development Standards
       □ Project Heslin Curriculum Model
       □ High/Scope Curriculum Model
       □ Creative Curriculum Model

    a. ______ The district’s application for Neglected or Delinquent funds is on file and describes the program to be implemented along with relevant formal agreements between the district and institutions to be served.
KEY:
DC = District Compliant
DR = District Resolving
DA = District Assistance
NA = Not Applicable to this district

   a. ______ The district can demonstrate that at least 10 percent of the building’s allocation has been allocated for professional development following a building’s failure to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and its identification for School Improvement. Funding must address the area(s) in which each building has been found to be deficient.
      Evidence Sources:
         ☐ BOA and Title I application
         ☐ Inservice sign-in sheets
         ☐ Records of expenditures
   b. ______ The district has notified parents of their school choice option.
      Evidence Source:
         ☐ Letter to parents
   c. ______ The district has notified parents of their Supplemental Educational Services options (for buildings in second year of improvement).
      Evidence Source:
         ☐ Letter to parents

Comments for items indicated DR – Please include plan and time frame for resolution:
Title II.A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting

1. Professional Development Needs Assessment (see Administrative Manual, p. 64):
   a. _____ A needs assessment for professional development was conducted within the last three years with input from public
      and nonpublic staff, including Title I-funded teachers.
   b. _____ Professional development decisions were based on student achievement data.
   c. _____ A CSIP/district professional development plan reflects the needs assessment findings.
      Evidence Sources:
      □ Educator surveys
      □ Minutes of professional development committee meetings
      □ Administrator assessments of teacher performance
      □ Other student data

2. Professional Development Activity Assessment (see Administrative Manual, p. 66):
   a. _____ The district provides evidence of assessing the activities in relation to the goals identified in the professional
      development plan (see the "Missouri Professional Development Guidelines for Student Success") or CSIP.
      Evidence Sources:
      □ Review of pre and/or post activity student achievement data
      □ Description of activity and objectives
      □ Student learning outcomes
      □ Planned or demonstrated uses of new knowledge and skills
      □ Dates of initial and follow-up activities
      □ Other: Please describe

3. Professional Development Activity Implementation (see Administrative Manual, p. 65):
   Each activity funded through Title II. A reflects the following high-quality professional development criteria:
   a. _____ Actively engages teachers on an ongoing basis
   b. _____ Is directly linked to improved student learning so that all children may meet the Show-Me Standards at the
      proficient level
   c. _____ Is directly linked to district CSIP and building school improvement plans
   d. _____ Is developed with extensive participation of teachers, parents, principals, and other administrators
   e. _____ Provides time and other resources for learning, practice, and follow-up
   f. _____ Is supported by district and building leadership
   g. _____ Provides teachers with the opportunity to give the district feedback on the effectiveness of participation in this
      professional development activity
      Evidence Sources:
      □ Lesson plans
      □ Teacher schedules
      □ Observation notes
      □ Minutes of meetings
      □ Pre and post surveys

4. Hiring Highly Qualified Teachers
   All teachers employed by the district are properly certified for their grade level/subject area.
   a. _____ The district has hired additional teachers to reduce class size.
   b. _____ The district has hired additional teachers for core academic subjects.
      Evidence Sources:
      □ Proper credentials and certificates are on file
      □ Board minutes or other report of student-teacher ratios and achievement data
KEY:
DC = District Compliant
DR = District Resolving
DA = District Assistance
NA = Not Applicable to this district

Comments for items indicated DR – Please include plan and time frame for resolution:
KEY:
DC = District Compliant
DR = District Resolving
DA = District Assistance
NA = Not Applicable to this district

Title II, D: Enhancing Education Through Technology

1. Professional Development (see Companion Document, p. 6)
   a. ______ The district can demonstrate that it has spent at least 25 percent of the total funds available for professional development that addresses the use of technology in instruction.

2. Internet Use Policy
   a. ______ The district has a board-approved Internet Use Policy and complies with the Children’s Internet Protection Act (CIPA).

Comments for items indicated DR – Please include plan and time frame for resolution:
1. **Consultation** (see *Administrative Manual*, p. 69):  
a. _____ The district provides evidence of ongoing consultation with State and local government representatives, representatives of schools to be served (including nonpublic), teachers and other staff, parents, students, community-based organizations, and others with relevant expertise in drug and violence prevention activities (such as medical, mental health, and law enforcement professionals) regarding how best to coordinate activities with other related strategies, programs, and activities being conducted in the community.  
   **Evidence Sources:**  
   - Dated agendas  
   - Meeting sign-in sheets indicating group affiliation  
   - Written recommendations (minutes from meetings)  
   - Dissemination of drug use and violence prevention information through pamphlets, brochures, etc.

2. **Activities Development and Assessment** (see *Administrative Manual*, pp. 89-73):  
a. _____ The district biennially conducts and analyzes the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) survey and/or alternative data.  
b. _____ The district and its advisory group annually evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Title IV. A activities as related to the six Principles of Effectiveness from the United States Department of Education.  
c. _____ Title IV. A funded activities are based on drug and violence assessment results and the six Principles of Effectiveness.  
   **Evidence Sources:**  
   - Survey Results  
   - Discipline and expulsion data  
   - Advisory Council meeting minutes

3. **Activity Implementation** (see *Comparison Document*, p. 7)  
a. _____ No more than 40 percent of the district's Title IV. A funds are being used for security personnel, of which no more than 50 percent is used for other security purposes.  
b. _____ Purchases relate to allowable uses and follow the guidance of the Principles of Effectiveness. (No purchase of give-away items.)

4. **Parent/Community Involvement** (see *Administrative Manual*, p. 73)  
a. _____ The district includes activities to facilitate input from parents and involve parents and community.  
   **Evidence Sources:**  
   - Parent education training/workshops/inservice/classes  
   - Letters to parents  
   - Schedules of parent education activities  
   - Flyers  
   - Sign-in sheets from parent education activities  
   - Media announcements, articles  
   - Questionnaires or surveys from parents

5. **Public Reporting** (see *Administrative Manual*, p. 70):  
a. _____ The district makes available to the public a report of its progress toward attaining the objectives specified in the CSIP.  
   **Evidence Sources:**  
   - Letters to parents  
   - Information in school newspaper  
   - Other: Please describe: ________________________________
KEY:
DC = District Compliant
DR = District Resolving
DA = District Assistance
NA = Not Applicable to this district

Comments for items indicated DR – Please include plan and time frame for resolution:
Title V. A: Innovative Programs

1. Systematic Consultation
   a. The district has consulted with parents and appropriate district staff in a needs assessment and planning for effective use of funds.
   Evidence Sources:
   - Agenda for meeting
   - Meeting sign-in sheets indicating person's role or title
   - Written recommendations (in meeting minutes)

2. Annual Evaluation (see Administrative Manual, p. 77)
   a. The district conducts an annual review that includes use of funds, students served, program strengths and weaknesses, and how student academic achievement was affected. The evaluation is used to make decisions about changes for use of funds for the next school year.
   Evidence Sources:
   - Agenda, meeting minutes
   - Usage records
   - Survey or other documentation

Comments for items indicated DR – Please include plan and time frame for resolution:
Title I Parent Phone Survey

Spring 2004

1. Do you know or have you talked with teacher's name, your child's Title I teacher this year?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

2. Are you familiar with the types of reading activities your child does in the Title I program at school name?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

3. How satisfied are you with your child's Title I program?
   ○ Very Dissatisfied  ○ Dissatisfied  ○ Neutral  ○ Not Applicable/Do Not Know
   ○ Satisfied  ○ Very Satisfied

4. Does your child talk about the Title I program?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

5. How does your child like it?
   ○ Not like it at all  ○ Somewhat likes it  ○ Moderate
   ○ Likes it  ○ Likes it very much  ○ Not applicable/I do not know

6. Do you think that your child's reading/writing skills have improved this year?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

7. If yes, to what degree?
   ○ Little improvement  ○ Somewhat improvement  ○ Moderate
   ○ Improvement  ○ Lot of improvement  ○ Not applicable/I do not know

8. Did you have the opportunity to participate in any parent activities at school this year?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

9. Was it a good experience for you?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

10. How would you rate the experience?
    ○ Not enjoyable  ○ Somewhat enjoyable  ○ Moderate
    ○ Enjoyable  ○ Very enjoyable  ○ Not applicable/I do not know

11. We have sent monthly Title I newsletters to parents/guardians. Have you had a chance to read it?
    ○ Yes  ○ No

12. How useful is the newsletter?
    ○ Not useful  ○ Somewhat useful  ○ Moderate
    ○ Useful  ○ Very useful  ○ Not applicable/I do not know

13. Have you been able to attend any of the workshops for parents that are listed in the Title I newsletter?
    ○ Yes  ○ No

14. Here are some ideas we're thinking of including in the newsletter next year, do you think they would be helpful?
   17.1 Low cost place for your family to visit?
       ○ Yes  ○ No

15. Articles on parenting
    ○ Yes  ○ No

16. Homework help
    ○ Yes  ○ No
Title I Parent Phone Survey

17.4 Reading
○ Yes ○ No

17.5 Discipline
○ Yes ○ No

19. Did your family have the opportunity to listen to any Dial-A-Story stories?
○ Yes ○ No

20. Did your child enjoy the story/stories?
○ Not enjoyable ○ Somewhat enjoyable ○ Moderate
○ Enjoyable ○ Very enjoyable ○ Not applicable/I do not know

21. Would you be interested in serving on a school or district parent committee?
○ Yes ○ No

22. If we're making changes in the Title 1 program and need parent perspective, would you be willing for me to call you to get your opinion?
○ Yes ○ No
Program Survey for Title I

The Title I program needs your help to determine its impact, success with students, and future involvement in your buildings. This survey was developed by the Title I staff. The results of the survey will be shared with the Title I staff and building administrators. Please complete this survey and return it in the enclosed envelope via intra-district mail to Phyllis Kulp at Title I, Central Office by May 20, 2004. Thanks for all your help. Your comments will help us improve the service that we provide to students. I hope you have had a wonderful year and are looking forward to the summer break. If you have any question, please contact Phyllis Kulp at 989-8542.

1. Please check one:
   ○ Administrator
   ○ Collaborative Teacher
   ○ Title I teacher

2. Please check one:
   ○ Ackerman
   ○ JDC
   ○ Lakeside
   ○ Litsinger
   ○ Neuweltner
   ○ Northview
   ○ Page
   ○ Southview

3. Are you aware of the purpose and expectations of the Title I program?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

4. How do you see your role in implementing and enhancing the Title I program?
   ○ Little Impact
   ○ Some Impact
   ○ Great Impact
   ○ Very Great Impact
   ○ Moderate Impact
   ○ Not applicable/I do not know

5. The Title I program benefits my students.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
   ○ Moderate
   ○ Not applicable/Do not know

6. Do you see any benefit in the Title I and collaborative teachers planning assignments and developing curriculum?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

7. If yes, to what extent do you see the benefit?
   ○ Little Benefit
   ○ Some Benefit
   ○ Great Benefit
   ○ Very Great Benefit
   ○ Moderate Benefit
   ○ Not applicable/I do not know

8. Check which of the reading/writing cross-curriculum activities the Title I teacher could assist you in implementing in your building. (Check that all applied)
   ○ Selection of materials
   ○ Strategies for comprehension
   ○ Differentiated instruction
   ○ Writing activities
   ○ Strategies for vocabulary
   ○ None
   ○ Other

9. Do you need further information clarifying the Missouri State regulations for Title I?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

   What topics?

10. How satisfied are you with the way that students are scheduled into the program?
    ○ Very Dissatisfied
    ○ Dissatisfied
    ○ Neutral
    ○ Satisfied
    ○ Very Satisfied
    ○ Not Applicable/Do Not Know

11. Comments (If you need additional space, please write on the back of the page)
APPENDIX 4-3
# AYP Goals and Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com Arts</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Group Must Make AYP In Both Subjects

- **All**
- **Pacific Islander**
- **Asian**
- **White**
- **Black**
- **Other**
- **Hispanic**
- **Free and Reduced Lunch**
- **Indian**
- **IEP**
- **LEP**

Intermediate goals – Equal increments that have all children at Proficient by 2014

LND (Level Not Determined) must not be more than 5%

Other Indicators: Elementary, Middle-Attendance, High School-Graduation rate
APPENDIX 4-5
HIGH-QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

All children deserve to be taught by highly qualified teachers, and all teachers deserve the opportunity to be involved in high-quality professional development. Following are Missouri’s criteria for high-quality professional development. Note the references to the National Staff Development Council’s Standards, which are provided in the parentheses.

Part I: High-quality professional development:
• actively engages teachers in planning, skills, and information over time, (Standard 2)
• is directly linked to improved student learning so that all children may meet the Show-Me Standards at the proficient level, (Standards 8, 10)
• is directly linked to district and building school improvement plans, (Standard 1)
• is developed with extensive participation of teachers, parents, principals, and other administrators, [Parent participation may be at the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) level] (Standards 1, 2, 9, 12)
• provides time and other resources for learning, practice, and follow-up, (Standards 3, 7)
• is supported by district and building leadership, (Standard 2)
• provides teachers with the opportunity to give the district feedback on the effectiveness of participation in this professional development activity, (Standard 5)

Part II: Some types of activities that might be considered high-quality professional development if they meet the above requirements are:
• study groups, (Standard 1)
• grade-level collaboration and work, (Standards 1, 9)
• content-area collaboration and work, (Standards 1, 9)
• specialization-area collaboration and work, (Standards 1, 9)
• action research and sharing of findings, (Standards 4, 6)
• modeling, (Standards 8, 9)
• peer coaching, (Standards 8, 9)
• vertical teaming, (Standards 8, 9)
• other ______________________________________________________________________________

Part III: Topics for high-quality professional development may include:
• content knowledge related to standards and classroom instruction, (Standard 11)
• instructional strategies related to content being taught in the classroom, (Standard 7)
• improving classroom management skills, (Standards 9, 10)
• a combination of content knowledge and content-specific teaching skills, (Standards 7, 11)
• the integration of academic and career education, (Standard 9)
• research-based instructional strategies, (Standards 6, 11)
• strategies to assist teachers in providing instruction to children with limited English proficiency to improve their language and academic skills, (Standard 10)
• strategies to assist teachers in creating and using classroom assessments, (Standard 5)
• instruction in the use of data to inform classroom practice, (Standards 4, 11)
• instruction in methods of teaching children with special needs, (Standard 10)
• instruction in linking secondary and post-secondary education, (Standard 9)
• involving families and other stakeholders in improving the learning of all students, (Standards 10, 12)
• strategies for integrating technology into instruction, (Standard 10)
• research and strategies for the education and care of preschool children, (Standard 6)
• research and strategies for closing achievement gaps between diverse groups of students, (Standard 10)
• other ______________________________________________________________________________

• To be considered high-quality professional development, the fully-implemented combined, ongoing activities in the district, building, and/or individual professional development plan(s) must meet all of the criteria in Part I and at least one criterion in Part II and one in Part III.
• Unless one-day workshops and short-term conferences or workshops are part of a fully-implemented professional development plan, they are not considered high-quality professional development.
• All fully-implemented activities in the plan(s) must be aligned to a priority of the district or building CSIP. If they are not fully-implemented, they shall not be funded with federal funds. A district may choose to support these activities with other funds, but may not report them via Core Data as high-quality professional development.
• Professional development activities should be regularly evaluated for impact on teacher effectiveness and improved student learning, (Standard 5).

Note: References to Standards indicate links to the National Staff Development Council’s Standards for Staff Development detailed on page 3.

Revised December 21, 2004
National Staff Development Council’s
Standards for Staff Development

Context Standards

1. **Learning Communities**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.1, 6.7.2, 6.7.5)

2. **Leadership**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.1, 6.7.5, 6.7.6)

3. **Resources**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.1, 6.7.6)

Process Standards

4. **Data-Driven**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and helps sustain continuous improvement. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.3, 6.7.4, 6.7.5)

5. **Evaluation**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.3, 6.7.4, 6.7.5)

6. **Research-Based**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.2, 6.7.3, 6.7.4)

7. **Design**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.3, 6.7.5)

8. **Learning**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.1, 6.7.2)

9. **Collaboration**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.2, 6.7.6)

Content Standards

10. **Equity**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students; create safe, orderly, and supportive learning environments; and hold high expectations for their academic achievement. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicator 6.7.5)

11. **Quality Teaching**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students deepens educators’ content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicators 6.7.1, 6.7.2, 6.7.3, 6.7.6)

12. **Family Involvement**: Staff development that improves the learning of all students provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately. (Related to MSIP Standard 6.7; Indicator 6.7.5)
Survey of Teachers - High-Quality Professional Development

To be considered high-quality professional development, the fully-implemented combined, ongoing activities in the district, building, and/or individual professional development plan(s) must meet all of the criteria in Part I and at least one criterion in Part II and one in Part III. Unless one-day workshops and short-term conferences or workshops are part of a fully-implemented professional development plan, they are not considered high-quality professional development. All completed activities in the plan must be aligned to a goal of the district or building CSIP.

Instructions: Reflect on your professional development experiences for the past school year. Check each criterion met. Forward your completed survey to the appropriate person in your building or district.

Part I: High-quality professional development:
___ actively engages teachers in planning, skills, and implementation over time.
___ is directly linked to improved student learning so that all children may meet the Show-Me Standards at the proficient level.
___ is directly linked to district and building school improvement plans.
___ is developed with extensive participation of teachers, parents, principals, and other administrators.
   * Parent participation may be at the CSIP level.
___ provides time and other resources for learning, practice, and follow-up.
___ is supported by district and building leadership.
___ provides teachers with the opportunity to give the district feedback on the effectiveness of participation in this professional development activity.

Part II: Types of activities that may be considered high-quality professional development if they meet the above requirements are:
___ study groups.*
___ grade-level collaboration and work.
___ content-area collaboration and work.
___ specialization-area collaboration and work.
___ action research and sharing of findings.*
___ modeling.*
___ peer coaching.*
___ vertical teaming.*
___ other
___ other
   *see definitions on page 5

Part III: Topics for high-quality professional development may include:
___ content knowledge related to standards and classroom instruction.
___ instructional strategies related to content being taught in the classroom.
___ improving classroom management skills.
___ a combination of content knowledge and content-specific teaching skills.
___ the integration of academic and career education.
___ research-based instructional strategies.
___ strategies to assist teachers in providing instruction to children with limited English proficiency to improve their language and academic skills.
___ strategies to assist teachers in creating and using classroom assessments.
___ instruction in the use of data to inform classroom practice.
___ instruction in methods of teaching children with special needs.
___ instruction in linking secondary and post-secondary education.
___ involving families and other stakeholders in improving the learning of all students.
___ strategies for integrating technology into instruction.
___ research and strategies for the education and care of preschool children.
___ research and strategies for closing achievement gaps between diverse groups of students.
___ other
Definitions for Some Terms in Part II of the Survey

**Study Groups** – groups of educators meet to learn new strategies and programs, to review new publications, or to review students’ work together. (Bernhardt)

**Action research** – teachers and/or administrators raise questions about the best way to improve teaching and learning, systematically study the literature to answer the questions, implement the best approach(es), and analyze the results. (Bernhardt)

**Modeling** – demonstrating best practices, instructional strategies, and effective communication for other educators to observe.

**Peer coaching** – non-evaluative observation of peers in order to give confidential feedback on instructional strategies, best practices, and communication.

**Vertical teaming** – groups of educators, and sometimes patrons, from more than one department or grade level working collaboratively on issues of school improvement.
APPENDIX 4-6
Title IV--Safe and Drug Free School & Communities
Parent Survey 2004-2005

Parent feedback is crucial in assessing the effectiveness of our Title IV grant. We are seeking your input to assist us in developing programs and providing educational opportunities for students, parents and our community. Please help us by completing this survey so that we may use your feedback to keep your children and our student safe, healthy, and drug-free. Return the survey to your school office or mail to Phyllis Kulp, Federal Programs, Special School District of St. Louis County, 12110 Clayton Rd., St. Louis, MO 63131 by January 21, 2005.

Darken the circle that best describe your feedback. If you do not know or the situation is not applicable to you, please simply leave the question blank. Think about the students in our district.

1. School
   ○ Ackerman School  ○ Bridges School  ○ Litzsinger School
   ○ Neuhoecker School  ○ Northview School  ○ Southview School
   ○ North Technical School  ○ South Technical School

2. Your child's grade level is between
   ○ Kindergarten to 6th grade  ○ 7th grade to 8th grade  ○ 9th grade to 12th grade

Response Definition: VC=Very concerned  SC=Somewhat concerned  MC=Moderate  LC=Little concerned  NC=Not concerned

3. How concerned are you about the reported use of alcohol? ................................................................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
4. How concerned are you about the reported use of tobacco and other tobacco products? .............................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
5. How concerned are you about the reported use of marijuana? ........................................................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
6. How concerned are you about the reported use of illegal drugs other than marijuana? ................................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
7. How concerned are you about the general level of violence or violent acts by students? ................................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
8. How concerned are you about bullying? ........................................................................................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
9. How concerned are you about verbal abuse by students? .................................................................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
10. How concerned are you about physical fights? ................................................................................................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
11. How concerned are you about other issues (please list specific concerns)? ........................................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Response Definition: N=Not at all  L=Limited  M=Moderate  E=Effective  VE=Very effective

12. How effective do you think our efforts have been in substance abuse education? ........................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
13. How effective do you think our efforts have been in peaceful problem solving efforts? ................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
14. How effective do you think our efforts have been in parent education? ............................................................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
15. How effective do you think our efforts have been in anger management education? ....................................... ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
16. How effective do you think our efforts have been in handling bullying? .............................................................. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Title IV--Safe and Drug Free School & Communities  
Parent Survey 2004-2005

Please rate how effective the following methods are in keeping you informed about our programs and activities related to keeping your children safe and drug-free.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: N=Not effective at all  L=Limited  M=Moderate  E=Effective  VE=Very effective</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Newsletters (like Helping Hand)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Workshop &amp; Training</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Information in Friday packets</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Building level newsletters</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. District newsletters (Channel) or other district publications</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other (please be specific)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What suggestions do you have to help get parents involved in school?

24. Would you like to be involved in the Title IV advisory council?                                
   If yes, Name:                                                                                   
   Contact information                                                                           

25. Is there anything else you would like to see the Special School District offer for students, parent and/or the community that would support efforts to keep our students safe, healthy and alcohol and other drug-free?
1. Do you know or have you talked with teacher's name, your child's Title I teacher this year?

1. Yes  
2. No  
Total Responses: 49
Mean: 1.47 Standard Deviation: 0.50

2. Are you familiar with the types of reading activities your child does in the Title I program at school name?

1. Yes  
2. No  
Total Responses: 50
Mean: 1.32 Standard Deviation: 0.47

3. How satisfied are you with your child's Title I program?

1. Very Dissatisfied  
2. Dissatisfied  
3. Neutral  
4. Satisfied  
5. Very Satisfied  
6. Not Applicable/Do Not Know  
Total Responses: 34
Mean: 4.68 Standard Deviation: 0.53

6. Does your child talk about the Title I program?

1. Yes  
2. No  
Total Responses: 50
Mean: 1.54 Standard Deviation: 0.50
Title I Parent Phone Survey Spring 2004

7. How does your child like it?

1. Not like it at all   0 0%
2. Somewhat likes it   0 0%
3. Moderate           1 4%
4. Likes it           7 25%
5. Likes it very much 17 61%
6. Not applicable/I do not know  3 11%
Total Responses: 28
Mean: 4.64 Standard Deviation: 0.57

8. Do you think that your child's reading/writing skills have improved this year?

1. Yes     47 96%
2. No      2  4%
Total Responses: 49
Mean: 1.04 Standard Deviation: 0.20

9. If yes, to what degree?

1. Little improvement 2  4%
2. Somewhat improvement 3  6%
3. Moderate           8 17%
4. Improvement       18 38%
5. Lot of improvement 16 34%
6. Not applicable/I do not know 0  0%
Total Responses: 47
Mean: 3.91 Standard Deviation: 1.08

10. Did you have the opportunity to participate in any parent activities at school this year?

1. Yes   10 20%
2. No    40 80%
Total Responses: 50
Mean: 1.80 Standard Deviation: 0.40
11. Was it a good experience for you?

- Yes: 10 (100%)
- No: 0 (0%)

Total Responses: 10
Mean: 1.00  Standard Deviation: 0.00

12. How would you rate the experience?

- Not enjoyable: 0 (0%)
- Somewhat enjoyable: 0 (0%)
- Moderate: 0 (0%)
- Enjoyable: 2 (20%)
- Very enjoyable: 8 (80%)
- Not applicable/I do not know: 0 (0%)

Total Responses: 10
Mean: 4.80  Standard Deviation: 0.42

13. We have sent monthly Title I newsletters to parents/guardians. Have you had a chance to read it?

- Yes: 33 (82%)
- No: 7 (18%)

Total Responses: 40
Mean: 1.18  Standard Deviation: 0.38

14. How useful is the newsletter?

- Not useful: 0 (0%)
- Somewhat useful: 0 (0%)
- Moderate: 4 (12%)
- Useful: 4 (12%)
- Very useful: 23 (72%)
- Not applicable/I do not know: 1 (3%)

Total Responses: 32
Mean: 4.61  Standard Deviation: 0.72
16. Have you been able to attend any of the workshops for parents that are listed in the Title I newsletter?

1. Yes 2 6%
2. No 30 94%
Total Responses: 32
Mean: 1.94  Standard Deviation: 0.25

17. Here are some ideas we're thinking of including in the newsletter next year, do you think they would be helpful?
17.1 Low cost place for your family to visit?

1. Yes 35 90%
2. No 4 10%
Total Responses: 39
Mean: 1.10  Standard Deviation: 0.31

17.2 Articles on parenting

1. Yes 33 85%
2. No 6 15%
Total Responses: 39
Mean: 1.15  Standard Deviation: 0.37

17.3 Homework help

1. Yes 35 90%
2. No 4 10%
Total Responses: 39
Mean: 1.10  Standard Deviation: 0.31
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17.4 Reading

1. Yes 35 90%
2. No 4 10%
Total Responses: 39
Mean: 1.10  Standard Deviation: 0.31

17.5 Discipline

1. Yes 36 92%
2. No 3 8%
Total Responses: 39
Mean: 1.08  Standard Deviation: 0.27

19. Did your family have the opportunity to listen to any Dial-A-Story stories?

1. Yes 12 24%
2. No 37 76%
Total Responses: 49
Mean: 1.76  Standard Deviation: 0.43

20. Did your child enjoy the story/stories?

1. Not enjoyable 0 0%
2. Somewhat enjoyable 1 8%
3. Moderate 1 8%
4. Enjoyable 2 17%
5. Very enjoyable 8 67%
6. Not applicable/I do not know 0 0%
Total Responses: 12
Mean: 4.42  Standard Deviation: 1.00
21. Would you be interested in serving on a school or district parent committee?

1. Yes  
2. No  
Total Responses: 48  
Mean: 1.73  Standard Deviation: 0.45

22. If we're making changes in the Title I program and need parent perspective, would you be willing for me to call you to get your opinion?

1. Yes  
2. No  
Total Responses: 49  
Mean: 1.04  Standard Deviation: 0.20
APPENDIX 5-2
STUDENTS’ CORNER

The following Haiku (a form of Japanese poetry) were written by Title I students at Northview.

Fishing
To catch a big fish
You use any kind of bait.
Minnows are the best.
by Frank

Bats
The bat flies at night.
The bat drinks a lot of blood.
He sleeps upside down.
by Terrance

Snakes
Snakes are reptiles;
smooth, slippery and fast.
They shed their old skin.
by Josh

Spiders
Spiders are arachnids.
Spiders eat other insects.
They spin soft, strong webs.
by Josh

Butterflies
I like butterflies.
They are colorful and sweet.
They are beautiful.
by Danielle

Colors
I like lots of colors;
Red, orange, yellow and green.
But my favorite color is pink.
by Danielle

WORKSHOP OPPORTUNITIES

Call 989-8317 for sign-up

NOVEMBER

Functional Behavioral Assessment & Positive Behavior Support: What Parents Need to Know presented by MPACT Staff. Tues., Nov. 16, 9:00 - 11:30 a.m. or 7:00 - 9:30 p.m. in Room 61, SSD Central Office. Learn to think differently about behavior, perform Functional Behavior Assessments and Functional Behavior Analysis, support students through problem behaviors, influence change in problem behaviors or behaviors that impede learning.

Strategies for Helping Your Child with Learning Disabilities Mon., Nov. 22, 9:00 - 11:00 a.m. or 7:00 - 9:00 p.m. in Room 61, SSD Central Office. Ideas for helping your child learn more effectively will be the focus of this workshop. Tips on helping with reading, spelling, math and memory tasks, with a focus on specific perceptual learning disabilities, will be included.

DECEMBER

Developing the Present Level of Performance and Writing Measurable Goals and Objectives presented by MPACT Staff, Mon., Dec. 6, 9:00 - 11:30 a.m. or 7:00 - 9:30 p.m. in Room 61, SSD Central Office. Learn to actively participate in the development of the Present Level of Performance and the development of Measurable Goals and Objectives/Benchmarks, and use these components to track meaningful progress for your child.
November is a busy month...

November 2nd is election day. Please vote! Schools will be open.

November 6th will be the Annual Veterans' Day parade in downtown St. Louis at 12:00 Noon. You can call 314-622-4550 for more information.

November 15 - 19th is American Education Week and Children’s Book Week. November is also National Native American History Month.

If you check your local library branch, many of them are having special events for Children’s Book Week and for National Native American History Month. Each branch differs, so check the one nearest you. You can check all the branches activities on-line at www.scel.lib.mo.us.

Then of course we can’t forget Thanksgiving on November 25th. Schools and the Administration Office will be closed November 25th & 26th for Thanksgiving.

Reading Planet Club

The new Reading Planet Club lets kids create webpages. The Reading Planet now offers a free kids’ club, an online community where kids can share their opinions in a safe setting.

Joining is free and easy and open to kids of all ages. Club membership allows each kid to:

♦ Create a Club webpage.
♦ Design a Reading Planet creature.
♦ Have the chance at being chosen Club President for a month.
♦ Keep track of what he or she is reading by setting up a virtual bookshelf.
♦ Get a sneak peak at contests.
♦ Vote for what goes into the Reading Planet website.
♦ Receive birthday greetings and read a monthly horoscope.
♦ Enter to win prizes by sharing opinions.

To join the club, go to www.rif.org/readingsplanet.

from the RIF “Read All About It”
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TITLE 1 TEACHERS

Ackerman - Merrilee Tanner 989-7217
JDC - Tammy Slater 862-6842
Lakeside - Pam Braun 989-9389
Litzsinger - Carol Eddy 989-8843
Neuwoehner - Marcia Garland 989-8700
Northview - Karen Fields 989-7312
Bridges - Marcia Garland 428-6109

Address Change?
Please contact Vanessa Griggs at 989-8543 and let her know of any address and/or phone number changes. Then we can keep you informed of upcoming events and information.
Title I Program Survey

Creation Date: 5/2/2005
Total Respondents: 48

1. Please check one:
   - Administrator: 10 (21%)
   - Collaborative Teacher: 31 (65%)
   - Title I Teacher: 7 (15%)
   Total Responses: 48
   Mean: 1.94  Standard Deviation: 0.60

2. Please check one:
   - Ackerman: 10 (21%)
   - JDC: 3 (6%)
   - Lakeside: 5 (10%)
   - Litzsinger: 6 (12%)
   - Neuwunsch: 7 (15%)
   - Northview: 9 (19%)
   - Page: 2 (4%)
   - Southview: 6 (12%)
   Total Responses: 48
   Mean: 4.29  Standard Deviation: 2.35

3. Are you aware of the purpose and expectations of the Title I program?
   - Yes: 46 (96%)
   - No: 2 (4%)
   Total Responses: 48
   Mean: 1.04  Standard Deviation: 0.20

4. How do you see your role in implementing and enhancing the Title I program?
   - Little Impact: 4 (8%)
   - Some Impact: 8 (17%)
   - Moderate Impact: 7 (15%)
   - Great Impact: 12 (25%)
   - Very Great Impact: 14 (29%)
   - Not applicable/I do not know: 1 (6%)
   Total Responses: 48
   Mean: 3.53  Standard Deviation: 1.34
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5. The Title I program benefits my students.

1. Strongly Disagree 2 4%
2. Disagree 0 0%
3. Moderate 7 15%
4. Agree 4 9%
5. Strongly Agree 33 70%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 1 2%
Total Responses: 47
Mean: 4.43 Standard Deviation: 1.05

6. Do you see any benefit in the Title I and collaborative teachers planning assignments and developing curriculum?

1. Yes 47 98%
2. No 1 2%
Total Responses: 48
Mean: 1.02 Standard Deviation: 0.14

7. If yes, to what extent do you see the benefit?

1. Little Benefit 0 0%
2. Some Benefit 5 11%
3. Moderate Benefit 6 13%
4. Great Benefit 12 26%
5. Very Great Benefit 21 46%
6. Not applicable/I do not know 2 4%
Total Responses: 46
Mean: 4.11 Standard Deviation: 1.04

8. Check which of the reading/writing cross-curriculum activities the Title I teacher could assist you in implementing in your building.
(Check that all applied)

1. Selection of materials 32 71%
2. Differentiated instruction 24 53%
3. Strategies for comprehension 32 71%
4. Strategies for vocabulary 28 62%
5. Writing activities 32 71%
6. None 1 2%
7. Other 2 4%
Total Responses: 45

Page 2
Title I Program Survey

9. Do you need further information clarifying the Missouri State regulations for Title I?
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   Total Responses:  
   Mean: 1.90  Standard Deviation: 0.31

10. How satisfied are you with the way that students are scheduled into the program?
   1. Very Dissatisfied  
   2. Dissatisfied  
   3. Neutral  
   4. Satisfied  
   5. Very Satisfied  
   6. Not Applicable/Do Not Know  
   Total Responses:  
   Mean: 4.19  Standard Deviation: 0.90
32. My child uses computers effectively at school.

1. Strongly Disagree 16 2%
2. Disagree 21 3%
3. Neutral 221 33%
4. Agree 262 39%
5. Strongly Agree 156 23%
Total Responses: 676
Mean: 3.77 Standard Deviation: 0.92

33. I know how well my child is doing in class.

1. Strongly Disagree 15 2%
2. Disagree 32 4%
3. Neutral 96 13%
4. Agree 353 48%
5. Strongly Agree 240 33%
Total Responses: 736
Mean: 4.05 Standard Deviation: 0.90

34. I feel my child is safe at school.

1. Strongly Disagree 12 2%
2. Disagree 16 2%
3. Neutral 122 18%
4. Agree 381 50%
5. Strongly Agree 224 30%
Total Responses: 755
Mean: 4.06 Standard Deviation: 0.83

35. I am welcome to discuss my child's educational needs with the school.

1. Strongly Disagree 12 2%
2. Disagree 7 1%
3. Neutral 55 7%
4. Agree 378 51%
5. Strongly Agree 295 39%
Total Responses: 747
Mean: 4.25 Standard Deviation: 0.77
APPENDIX 5-5
**Consolidated Federal Programs Spending Breakdown**

**FY04 and FY05**

### Federal Formula Programs - FY 2003-2004

- **Salaries**: 70%
- **Employee Benefits**: 15%
- **Indirect Cost**: 3%
- **Program Administration**: 7%
- **Materials & Supplies**: 4%
- **Purchased Services**: 1%

### Federal Formula Programs - FY 2004-2005

- **Salaries**: 62%
- **Employee Benefits**: 14%
- **Indirect Cost**: 3%
- **Program Administration**: 7%
- **Materials & Supplies**: 8%
- **Purchased Services**: 6%
Title I.A Spending Breakdown

FY04 and FY05

Title I.A - FY 2003-2004

- Salaries: 73%
- Employee Benefits: 16%
- Program Administration: 7%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Materials & Supplies: 1%
- Purchased Services: 0%

Title I.A - FY 2004-2005

- Salaries: 68%
- Employee Benefits: 16%
- Program Administration: 7%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Materials & Supplies: 4%
- Purchased Services: 2%
Title II.D Spending Breakdown

FY04 and FY05

Title II.D - FY 2003-2004

- Salaries: 84%
- Program Administration: 7%
- Employee Benefits: 6%
- Indirect Cost: 3%

Title II.D - FY 2004-2005

- Salaries: 81%
- Program Administration: 6%
- Employee Benefits: 10%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
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Title II.A Spending Breakdown

FY04 and FY05

Title II.A - FY 2003-2004
- Salaries: 67%
- Program Administration: 8%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Employee Benefits: 14%
- Purchased Services: 5%
- Materials & Supplies: 3%

Title II.A - FY 2004-2005
- Salaries: 35%
- Purchased Services: 27%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Program Administration: 7%
- Employee Benefits: 5%
- Materials & Supplies: 23%
Title IV.A Spending Breakdown

FY04 and FY05

Title IV.A - FY 2003-2004

- Program Administration: 2%
- Salaries: 7%
- Employee Benefits: 1%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Materials & Supplies: 49%
- Purchased Services: 38%

Title IV.A - FY 2004-2005

- Program Administration: 2%
- Salaries: 7%
- Employee Benefits: 1%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Materials & Supplies: 8%
- Purchased Services: 79%
Title V Spending Breakdown

FY04 and FY05

Title V - FY 2003-2004
- Purchased Services: 0%
- Salaries: 0%
- Employee Benefits: 0%
- Salaries: 7%
- Indirect Cost: 3%
- Materials & Supplies: 90%

Title V - FY 2004-2005
- Purchased Services: 0%
- Salaries: 58%
- Employee Benefits: 8%
- Program Administration: 7%
- Indirect Cost: 2%
- Materials & Supplies: 25%