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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Special School District is committed to program improvement through the process of program evaluation. The program evaluation framework approved by the Board of Education (2003) guides program improvement through the evaluation of special education services, procedures and operations. The program evaluation for students with mental retardation was a formative process occurring from January 2005 through July 2005. This report discusses the process, results and recommendations that will be used in future improvement for services for this population.

Stakeholders were engaged in this process through a steering committee, work group and public forum. The committee members included teachers, parents, administrators, and community members (Appendix 1-1). The questions formed by the committee were designed to focus on literacy development for students with mental retardation.

Due to federal mandates (IDEA and NCLB) students must make progress and/or become proficient for their skill level in the area of literacy. Literacy, for purposes of this program evaluation, is defined as the ability to speak, listen, read and write in order to construct meaning. This program evaluation will utilize disaggregated and longitudinal assessment data (MSIP Standard 6.2) along with other data to make recommendations regarding instructional programs designed to meet the needs of the students, as well as practices and procedures needed to support these programs (MSIP Standard 6.3).

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 does research indicate is “best practice” in the provision of services to students with a diagnosis of mental retardation in the area of literacy?
2. How are students with a diagnosis of mental retardation provided literacy instruction in the Special School District schools and in Partner Districts?
3. How do we measure progress in the area of literacy for students with mental retardation?
4. What types of progress are we making in the area of literacy with students who have a diagnosis of mental retardation?
Literature Review

The focus of the literature review was to answer the first evaluation question of the Study, “What does research indicate is best practice in the provision of services to students with a diagnosis of mental retardation in the area of literacy?”

Population Studied

The literature review primarily covered students with the diagnosis of Mental Retardation. Several of the studies and readings targeted students with Down’s Syndrome and a few addressed children with Autism. The review included students with severe, moderate, and mild cognitive disabilities with the greatest number of studies falling in the moderate range, followed by the severe category. The age of the population encountered was pre-school through adult.

General Background/Findings

The Steering Committee found limited information in the area of literacy for the population of students with mental retardation.

Most of the studies found trained sight words in small sets. With the increased focus on inclusion of students with moderate and severe disabilities in general education, functional academic skills such as sight word reading are receiving renewed attention. Some of the new research around inclusion has focused on sight word instruction, using either peer tutors or heterogeneous groups. Although functional academic skills have the potential to be especially useful to enhance life skills and increase general education participation, research on this is a small fraction of the instructional research with individuals with severe disabilities.

Only about half of the studies measured comprehension in some way. Most interventions were provided individually, but some used small group instruction. Across all interventions, the most typical reinforcement was verbal praise, followed by the use of some type of token or tangible.

Virtually every review of the literature on reading and mental retardation finds people with mental retardation read well below their own mental age.

Many of the articles reviewed reinforced the concept/belief that all children need effective early literacy instruction grounded in research-based practices. Hedrick, W.B. (1999) conducted a year long study suggesting students with mental retardation should not be excluded from instruction in the area of literacy and can benefit from an approach incorporating both traditional
and current views of literacy instruction. Therefore in examining topic areas in literacy and mental retardation, our Steering Committee looked for those identified in the Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read (2000). Topics for their study were adapted and shortened by our Committee under the heading of instructional components for our purposes.

Until recently, the field has de-emphasized literacy for students with mental retardation. Part of the explanation could be that historically practitioners have de-emphasized literacy learning and instead concentrated more on the social, personal and vocational domains. (Katims, David 2000) Many teachers have viewed the severely disabled as incapable of learning to read and write, therefore few opportunities have been given to learn written language. If teachers included literacy as part of their instructional program, the skills introduced were most likely in word level skills and drill activities of those single words. Erickson and Koppenhaver (1995) state teachers need to be aware that students with severe disabilities have the capacity for literacy and begin to look for symbolic presence from which to build.

Students with mental retardation have generally not been provided with a literacy rich environment at an early age. Also, students with mental retardation are introduced and taught reading skills at a later age than their normally developing peers.

The most frequently reported and effective strategies cited in the research reviewed on literacy for students with mental retardation are summarized in the following list:

A. Sight word instruction  
B. Decoding/word analysis  
C. Meaningful/personal vocabulary  
D. Modeling/social interactions  
E. Opportunities for choral, paired and individual reading  
F. Writing opportunities  
G. Spelling  
H. Multi-media computer and video instruction  
I. Essential skills/functional use of sight words

**Methodology**

Data was gathered by a review of available demographic information, quality indicators derived from literature review, teacher surveys, administrator observation checklists, parent survey, public forum, teacher work group input, IEP file review, MAP data and cost analysis.
**Results**

**Strengths**

Several areas of strength were identified. Parents indicated overall satisfaction with their child’s special education teacher. Parents reported they are informed of their child’s progress and are welcome to discuss their child’s educational needs with the special education staff. They also noted the special education staff shows respect for their child. Parents additionally indicated they support their child’s learning at home. The latter was found in the literature to be important in the development of literacy skills for students with mental retardation.

Several instructional strengths were noted as well. As reported by teacher and observed by area coordinators, teachers have high expectations for students with mental retardation and use knowledge of students to design lessons. Teachers provide a literacy rich environment for their students. It was found teachers teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge. The biggest behavior change noted by teachers was an increase in their students’ word knowledge. This is consistent with the literature review, which indicates word knowledge is important for students in order to enhance daily living and job skills.

Strengths were also found in the teachers’ use of adaptation/modifications, repetition and slower pacing as supports for students with mental retardation. These supports were evidenced through both the teacher survey and administrator observation checklist. During the IEP review, it was found that 100% of the IEPs reviewed contained literacy goals. There was an average of three goals per student. This indicated we are focusing on literacy skills with the students who have a diagnosis of mental retardation and this focus is being maintained across grade levels to some degree.

**Weaknesses**

The program evaluation found three main areas of challenge.

**Training/Support**

Both teachers and area coordinators indicated the need for additional training in the areas of learning strategies for reading and writing instruction specifically tailored to the population they teach. Staff also reported a need for increased support and access to instructional resources and materials to support literacy instruction. These areas of challenge were reflected in the teacher survey, administrator observation checklist and feedback from the sub work group comprised of special education teachers. The teacher survey and administrator observation checklist also revealed a discrepancy between the teachers’ perception of their literacy instruction and the expectations of the administrators.
Technology Support
Teachers indicated the need for more awareness of assistive and instructional technology that can be utilized with students with mental retardation during literacy instruction. Teachers also expressed the need for more support in accessing and using technology. This was revealed through the teacher survey and input from the teacher sub work group.

Progress Monitoring
The IEP review indicated weaknesses in the measurement and documentation of progress on IEP goals. Analysis of grade level MAP data for monitoring progress of individual students was also found to be a weakness.

Limitations
The information collected provided the committee with a significant amount of data not previously reviewed and analyzed by the district for the population of students with mental retardation. However, in the process of gathering this information the committee noted several limitations, which should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of the study.

1. The research in the area of literacy and students with disabilities, especially the population diagnosed with mental retardation, is severely limited.

2. Many of the studies found were research based but few were research validated. Populations utilized in these same studies were relatively small and were not longitudinal in nature.

3. The length of time allocated for completion for a study of this magnitude was relatively short.

4. The timing for staff participating on committees was restrictive due to timelines for major activities in the study conflicting with end of school year responsibilities.

5. Due to time and resource limitations the committee was unable, on an extensive basis, to examine the discrepancy between teacher perceptions of progress monitoring and the committee’s IEP file review.
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Recommendations

The recommendations address the areas of weakness revealed through the program evaluation. Recommendations have been made in the areas of training/support, technology support and progress monitoring. Action plans have been developed to address these recommendations.

1. Provide training for best practices in literacy instruction including learning strategies and instructional resources. Considerations should include differentiated training for elementary and secondary staff as well as student ability level, in order to address the specific needs of the population.

2. Ensure that staff is aware of MSIP standards and best practice requirements for a specified amount of instructional minutes in literacy for students; including those with mental retardation.

3. Provide training opportunities for use of consistent and meaningful data collection and progress monitoring to guide instructional planning as it relates to literacy. Considerations should include goal writing and progress reporting procedures through the IEP process.

4. Require staff to record percentages on IEP goal evaluation for each reporting period throughout the duration of annual IEP.

5. Require staff to record percentages on IEP goal evaluation for each reporting period throughout the duration of annual IEP.

6. Increase administrator and staff awareness of resources and process to access assistive technology and instructional software for use in literacy instruction.

7. Utilize the current Performance Based Evaluation process to clarify administrator expectations of instructional staff regarding skill sets as they relate to literacy instruction for the population of students with mental retardation.

8. MAP data should be analyzed, to provide an additional source of data, using item analysis for individual students to assist teachers in instructional planning for literacy instruction.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose

Special School District is committed to program improvement through the process of program evaluation. The program evaluation framework approved by the Board of Education (2003) guides program improvement through the evaluation of special education services, procedures and operations. The program evaluation for students with mental retardation was a formative process occurring from January 2005 through July 2005. This report discusses the process, results and recommendations that will be used in future improvement for services for this population.

Stakeholders were engaged in this process through a steering committee, work group and public forum. The committee members included teachers, parents, administrators, and community members (Appendix 1-1). The questions formed by the committee were designed to focus on literacy development for students with mental retardation.

Due to federal mandates (IDEA and NCLB) students must make progress and/or become proficient for their skill level in the area of literacy. Literacy, for purposes of this program evaluation, is defined as the ability to speak, listen, read and write in order to construct meaning. This program evaluation will utilize disaggregated and longitudinal assessment data (MSIP Standard 6.2) along with other data to make recommendations regarding instructional programs designed to meet the needs of the students, as well as practices and procedures needed to support these programs (MSIP Standard 6.3).

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 does research indicate is “best practice” in the provision of services to students with a diagnosis of mental retardation in the area of literacy?
2. How are students with a diagnosis of mental retardation provided literacy instruction in the Special School District schools and in Partner Districts?
3. How do we measure progress in the area of literacy for students with mental retardation?
4. What types of progress are we making in the area of literacy with students who have a diagnosis of mental retardation?
Structure of the Report

The report documents the review of current literature and methodology for data collection. The analysis of data and results are addressed along with the recommendations from the committee. The limitations of this program evaluation are also addressed. Action plans have been developed by the committee to assist in the implementation of the recommendations as approved by the Board of Education.
CHAPTER II
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Criteria

“Mental Retardation”, according to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Program Definition, is defined as significantly sub average general intellectual functioning, which adversely affects a child’s educational performance and exists concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior manifested during the developmental period.

Curriculum

Curriculum for school-age students with the educational diagnosis of mental retardation follows the general education curriculum of the school district where the student attends school. Education teams focus on enhancing the student’s independence by participation in activities with peers. Teams also look toward the real-life needs of the student as an adult and specific skills are identified. Next, the education team identifies which activities the student requires an adaptation for, develops and initiates the use of the adaptation and evaluates the adaptation’s effectiveness. The student’s individualized education plan provides further specificity and direction to blend the demands of the general education curriculum with the student’s present and future learning needs.

Service and Placement Options

The individual needs of the student determine the direction for programming, services and placement. Educators and parents work together to identify the services and placement needed to meet the student’s educational needs. The team follows three basic guidelines: a) support the student in the least restrictive setting; b) consider all service delivery options before finalizing placement decisions; and c) consider carefully the student and family variables along with evaluation information in making programming decisions.

Given these guidelines, educators and parents consider the following placement options:

1. **Outside Regular Class less than 21 percent of day**: Children with disabilities who receive special education and related services outside the regular classroom for less than 21 percent of the school day.
2. **Outside Regular Class as least 21 percent/No more than 60 percent**: Children with disabilities who receive all their special education and related services outside the regular classroom for at least 21 percent but no more than 60 percent of the school day.
3. **Outside of Regular Class more than 60 percent of day:** Children with disabilities who receive all of their special education and related services outside the regular classroom for more than 60 percent of the school day. This category does not include children who receive education program in public or private separate day or residential facilities.

4. **Public Separate (Day) Facility:** Children who receive all of their special education and related services for greater than 50 percent of the school day in public separate facilities.

5. **Private Separate (Day) Facility:** Children with disabilities who receive all of their special education and related services, at public expense, for greater than 50 percent of the school day in private separate facilities.

6. **Public Residential Facility:** Children with disabilities who receive all of their special education and related services for greater than 50 percent of the school day in public residential facilities.

7. **Private Residential Facility:** Children with disabilities who receive all of their special education and related services, at public expense, for greater than 50 percent of the school day in private residential facilities.

8. **Homebound/Hospital:** Children with disabilities who receive all of their special education and related services in hospital programs or homebound programs.

**Engagement Activities**

Families are important partners in the educational process for students with mental retardation. Consistent with this belief, the education staff maintains frequent home-school communication and provides numerous parent education/information sessions. Teachers and related service providers work intensively with parents to assist them with their concerns and home-related issues. In addition, parents are linked with the Parent Advisory Councils within their districts and have access to resources from the Family & Community Resource Center.

**Enrollment Data**

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education publishes a *Special Education District Profile* annually for each district in the fall of the school year using census data from the December 1 count of the previous school year. The profile reports contain twelve tables compiling core data entered for the school year reporting cycle. The tables are based on four general reporting areas:

1. **School Age Child Count Data**
2. Early Childhood Child Count Data  
3. Missouri Assessment Program Data  
4. Discipline Incident Data

The *Special Education District Profile* is one of the data sources used to compare local data to Missouri data and provide information for program evaluation. The census data used for this program evaluation included the School Age Child Count Data by home district as well as the School Age Child Count Data by attending district showing the count by gender, ethnicity, and grade level. This information can be found in Appendix 2-1 and 2-2.
CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed was taken from a University search using the terms literacy and mental retardation limited to the last ten years. Additionally, several members of the Steering Committee brought in suggested readings. Both sources yielded articles from professional journals and books. The focus of the literature review was to answer the first evaluation question of the Study, “What does research indicate is best practice in the provision of services to students with a diagnosis of mental retardation in the area of literacy?”

Population Studied

Our Literature Review primarily covered students with the diagnosis of Mental Retardation. Several of the studies and readings targeted students with the specific medical diagnosis of Down’s Syndrome. There were also a few articles regarding children with Autism. On the continuum of Mental Retardation from the Profound through the Mild ranges, the Review included students with Severe, Moderate, and Mild cognitive disabilities. There were not any readings found on students with Mental Retardation in the profound range. The age of the population encountered was pre-school through adult. However, the greatest number of those fell in the elementary age group, followed by what the literature referred to as “school age” population. Of the ranges specified, the greatest number fell in the moderate range, followed by the severe category.

General Background/Findings

The Steering Committee found a dearth of information in the area of Literacy for the population of students with mental retardation. Barbara Ehren, a national presenter, at a recent (June 2005) Literacy Institute on the campus of Maryville University, stated that there was a scarcity of research in the area of literacy and students with disabilities nationwide.

Most of the studies found, trained sight words in small sets. Through the acquisition of sight words, individuals with moderate and severe disabilities can enhance their daily living and job skills. With the increased focus on inclusion of students with moderate and severe disabilities in general education, functional academic skills such as sight word reading are receiving renewed attention. Some of the new research around inclusion has focused on sight word instruction,
using either peer tutors or heterogeneous groups. Although functional academic skills have the potential to be especially useful to enhance life skills and increase general education participation, research on this is a small fraction of the instructional research with individuals with severe disabilities. Only about half of the studies measured comprehension in some way, for example, through functional use of the sight word, finding the words in real settings or on real materials, or picture or object matching. Most interventions were provided individually, but some used small group instruction. The interventions used more pre-response prompting than post-response procedures like corrective feedback. Across all interventions, the most typical reinforcement was verbal praise, followed by the use of some type of token or tangible.

Virtually every review of the literature on reading and mental retardation finds people with mental retardation read well below their own mental age. Koppenhaver and Yoder (1992) found that roughly 90% of students with multiple disabilities never learn to read above a 2nd grade level.

Many of the articles reviewed reinforced the concept/belief that all children need effective early literacy instruction grounded in research-based practices. Hedrick, W.B. (1999) conducted a year long study suggesting students with mental retardation should not be excluded from instruction in the area of literacy and can benefit from an approach incorporating both traditional and current views of literacy instruction. Therefore in examining topic areas in literacy and mental retardation, our Steering Committee looked for those identified in the Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read (2000). Topics for their study, which were adapted and shortened by our Committee under the heading of Instructional Components for our purposes, included:

Alphabetics

- Phonemic Awareness Instruction
- Phonics Instruction

Fluency

Comprehension

- Vocabulary Instruction
- Text Comprehension

Again, what we found in the literature for students with mental retardation was primarily information under Alphabetics and vocabulary instruction under Comprehension. Baker, et al (1994) stated beginning literacy should focus on phonological awareness, alphabetic understanding and automaticity.
Until recently, the field has de-emphasized literacy for students with mental retardation. Part of the explanation could be historically practitioners have de-emphasized literacy learning and instead concentrated more on the social, personal and vocational domains. (Katims, David 2000) Many teachers have viewed the severely disabled as incapable of learning to read and write, therefore few opportunities have been given to learn written language. Studies by Koppenhaver, Evans & Yoder, (1991) and Light, et al. (1990) revealed children with physical impairments rarely had access to writing tools or the opportunity to use them. If teachers included literacy as part of their instructional program, the skills introduced were and often are most likely in word level skills and drill activities of those single words. Erickson and Koppenhaver (1995) state teachers need to be aware that students with severe disabilities have the capacity for literacy and begin to look for symbolic presence from which to build. According to a study of students with Down Syndrome, (Kliwer,C., &Biklen, D. 2001), teachers who establish a value that all children are competently symbolic impact on their interpretations of student behavior and communication.

Students with mental retardation have generally not been provided with a literacy rich environment at an early age. Bradley, Rock, Calswell, and Brisby (1989) report preschool children with developmental disabilities are often provided with fewer games, toys, and learning materials than their non-disabled peers. Also, students with mental retardation are introduced and taught reading skills at a later age than their normally developing peers.

Our Steering Committee did not encounter any significant research in the area of Fluency.

**Best Practice Strategies Cited**

The most frequently reported and effective strategies cited in the research reviewed on literacy for students with mental retardation are summarized in the following list:

- J. Sight word instruction
- K. Decoding/word analysis
- L. Meaningful/personal vocabulary
- M. Modeling/social interactions
- N. Opportunities for choral, pared and individual reading
- O. Writing opportunities
- P. Spelling
- Q. Multi-media computer and video instruction
- R. Essential skills/functional use of sight words
In a review and analysis of research, Conners, Frances (1992) state that not only sight-word instruction but also word-analysis instruction is feasible and appropriate for this population. The sight-word instruction literature suggested picture integration, constant delay, and the Edmark Reading Program methods are the most effective at the time of the study. Further, picture-integration techniques were successfully modified to teach word-analysis skills. Several investigators found acquisition of reading or reading skills using a phonics approach was effective. Finally, in this review word/phonic analysis was shown to be superior to word-supply methods. More recently in an article published in the CEC Journal (2004) Broun, Leslie studied Oelwein’s methodology with elementary students with pervasive developmental disorders. Principals of the methodology included:

1. Whole word sight recognition. It is suggested students acquire a sight vocabulary of 25 to 50 words before proceeding to sound/symbol associations with familiar words, thus giving the letters a meaningful context.
2. Using personal and meaningful vocabulary. Children’s reading material needs to be relevant to their own experience. This would include names of loved ones, siblings, pets, favorite foods, toys, places, etc.
3. Readiness Skills. The ability to match is the prerequisite skill for participation in this methodology.

Also recommended in another study, (Browder & Stewart, 1996) was teaching new sight words by mixing known words with unknown sight words in flashcard drills.

In order to facilitate children’s development, particularly children with intellectual disabilities, it is necessary to provide an environment with models of readers, opportunities for exploring literacy in practical activities, and interaction with adults and peers in literacy activities.

Another study (Erickson & Koppenhaver, 1995) examined the combined use of technology and child-centered instruction, which resulted in the active participation of students who are severely disabled in reading and writing activities. Teachers emphasized reading and writing activities that were child directed and constructive rather than teacher directed and reactive. The program strategies consisted of four basic literacy components: a) writing during calendar time; b) directed reading in small groups or individually; c) use of computer software; and d) group activities. Use of multi-media computer-based and video based instruction is becoming more widely recognized as a means for authentically simulating environments where skill must be applied and when community-based instruction is limited due to a lack of resources. For example reading words on aisle signs in a grocery store.

A number of articles and books focused on students with the medical diagnosis of Downs Syndrome. The link between spoken language and reading skills was stressed. The following summarizes much of the compilation of insights and experiences reported while teaching reading to children with Down’s Syndrome:
--- Reading practice improves phonology and articulation
--- Symbol systems are not a stepping stone to print – they are an alternative
--- Start with whole word and move to letter sound correspondence
--- Teaching letter sounds in isolation (isolated from reading) is not recommended
--- Visual rather than auditory presentation so response can be manual or selected
--- Visual memory more effective than auditory memory for information (short)
--- Computer programs are beneficial
--- Establish a sight vocabulary

Historical methods for people with mental retardation were based on skills-based literacy instruction such as alphabet, phonics approach, multi-sensory approach with manual tracing, computer-assisted instruction, words in color, etc. The more contemporary approaches are based on integrated and contextualized literacy instruction such as integrated reading and writing approach, language experience unit approach, immersion in literacy-rich environments, whole language, and four-block: multi-method approach. The four-block approach traditionally includes a basal block, literature block, word block, and writing block.

Current Best Practice Recommendations

Sight word instruction has been highly effective for individuals with moderate and severe disabilities. Most functional academics involve some discrimination of words or symbols. There needs to be early, active focus on comprehension and cooperative grouping practices. Literacy needs to be broadly defined as the construction of meaning and teachers who support the development of symbolic capabilities in students with severe disabilities realize that social engagement drives the development of these capabilities. Established methodologies and programs can and should be used with this population include choral repeated readings, shared book experiences, the language experience approach, guided reading, and the four-block multi-method literacy framework.

While there is no one best method identified, teachers must be aware of a child’s background and individual needs (e.g., learning style). The following factors are important to providing supportive environments for students with mental retardation in the area of literacy:

- Early and continual literacy rich environments
- Motivation to want to read and to want to engage in reading
- Book readings and other literacy activities with the assistance of an adult, parent, and/or older competent reader
- Individualized or small group well planned, effective instruction in the basics or “how tos” of reading grounded in research-based practices
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- Access and opportunity to read a wide variety of materials at appropriate instructional and independent levels
- Providing time to hear stories, to read in real texts, repeated readings and/or retelling of familiar stories
- High Expectations
- Self-esteem and confidence, which play integral roles in successful reading development
- Use and application of computer assistive devices and computer assisted instruction/software
- Assessment is important
- Visual support is key

Limitations

In almost all of the research reviewed, the population studied was relatively small. Some authors themselves commented on this fact. Any research based studies were generally not research validated. A study on elementary school students with mild/moderate retardation using the Four Block Language Arts Program, for example, stated the approach is research validated only for use in the general education setting. However beyond these authors’ yearlong study, (Kliwer and Biklen, 2001) there is virtually no research regarding use of this approach with students with mental retardation. Also, the length of the studies were brief, but research indicates improvement occurring in children with disabilities is more visible over an extended period of time.

In many of the articles there was no data cited because strategies utilized were not research based but rather a compilation of insights and experience teaching reading to children with mental retardation. Examples of some of the informal tools utilized to judge effectiveness of strategies included parent and teacher interviews, student observational surveys and checklists, pre and post testing, rubrics, and portfolio assessments.

Finally in addition to the relative scarcity of research in the area studied, the Steering Committee had a limited time line in which to conduct the review.
CHAPTER IV

 METHODOLOGY

The focus of this chapter is the process involved in the collection and analysis of data used in the program evaluation for students with mental retardation.

Process

The program evaluation process engaged a variety of stakeholders. A steering committee was formed to guide the process and work collaboratively on program evaluation tasks and activities. The steering committee included a director, area coordinators, an effective practice specialist and an instructional facilitator. The committee met several times a month during the program evaluation to formulate questions, conduct a literature review, collect and analyze data and formulate recommendations.

A work group including teachers, parents and community members was also formed to provide feedback regarding the process as well as recommendations based on the results of the data analysis.

Methods for Data Collection and Analysis

There were six methods used to collect data. The methods used to address the focus questions are reflected in Table 1. Sources used in the data collection process are noted in Table 2.
Table 1: Evaluation Focus Questions and Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MR Program Evaluation Focus Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What does research indicate is “best practice” in provision of services to students with mental retardation in the area of literacy?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How are students with mental retardation provided literacy instruction in the Special School District schools and in partner districts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do we measure progress for students with mental retardation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What types of gains are we making with students with mental retardation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Data Sources and Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD Staff/Teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation Committees</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Evaluation for Students with Mental Retardation

Literature Review/Quality Indicators of Best Practices:
The committee reviewed literature obtained from professional journals through a University search examining best practices for literacy instruction for students with mental retardation. Additionally, the instructional facilitator brought in articles and books examining the same topic. Three major components of literacy instruction were identified as best practice: 1) instructional components; 2) strategies; 3) supports. Quality indicators within each of these areas are discussed in detail in the Results section in Chapter 6. These quality indicators were used in the development of the staff survey, administrator survey, and the public forum format.

Staff Survey: The staff survey was sent to all teachers who had two or more school-aged students with mental retardation on his/her caseload. The survey was sent to 320 teachers. The survey asked teachers to identify methods used in literacy instruction with this population. Teachers were also asked to rate their perception of implementation of quality indicators for literacy instruction for their students in this population using a five point Likert scale.

Administrator Observation Checklist: Observation Checklist Surveys were also sent to special education area coordinators and principals who had the teachers with two or more students with mental retardation on his/her caseload. There were 69 administrators with teachers who met the aforementioned criterion. Each of these administrators was asked to complete an Observation Checklist survey on two of their teachers. There were a total of 138 surveys sent to administrators. The administrators were asked to identify methods used by their teachers to provide literacy instruction. They were also asked to rate their perception of the teachers’ implementation of quality indicators in literacy instruction for students with mental retardation.

Parent Surveys: The Parent Climate Survey was sent to all families receiving SSD services. That included 1,397 parents / guardians of a child with an educational diagnosis of mental retardation who were on the district’s information database as of April 2005. Surveys were returned from 176 families, yielding a 13% return rate. There were responses from families in 21 school districts and the SSD schools. Fifty-seven percent of the parents responded indicated their child receives special education more than 60% of the school day.

Public Forum: A public forum was held to provide parents/guardians, partner district personnel, Special School District staff and community members the opportunity to give input regarding the program evaluation process, best practices and recommendations. Notification of the forum was posted on the Special School District website, flyers were provided to the Parent Advisory Council, staff were notified through voicemail, and parents of students with mental retardation were sent flyers by their child’s special education teacher. The forum was held on Wednesday, May 11 2005 from 6:30 to 7:30 in Special School District’s Central Office. One speech/language pathologist placed in the Normandy School District attended the public forum. A brief overview of the program evaluation process was provided along with a handout of the quality indicators found through the literature review. Co-chairs and steering committee
members were available for discussions and questions. Verbal input and feedback was noted and utilized during the recommendation process.

**Record review: IEP Goal Review:** An IEP goal review was utilized to assess the type of gains being made in the area of literacy for students with mental retardation. This process involved obtaining a list of all students with the diagnosis of mental retardation receiving services through Special School District. The Director of Program Evaluation determined the statistically significant number of files to be reviewed from each district based on the total population. The steering committee selected the schools within each district from which to pull files. They also attempted to select an equal distribution of elementary and secondary schools. A list of the students with mental retardation in the selected schools was generated. A blind pick was then utilized to select the student files to be reviewed.

The data, recording tool utilized for the file review was developed by the steering committee. It was used to collect demographic information, document the presence or absence of literacy goals, and document whether the goals were met, not met or no evidence of progress was substantiated. Progress towards the goal was recorded as not met. The committee members reviewing the files were instructed to count goals as being literacy goals if they fell in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

**MAP Data:** Results of the Communication Arts section were reviewed for all students with mental retardation in St. Louis County who took the Missouri Assessment Program over the last five years. Results were available from 2000 to 2004. The committee reviewed the number of students taking the test at each grade level as well as reported proficiency ratings and index scores.

**Cost Analysis:** Weekly IEP service minutes including related services were obtained for all IEP students by placement and primary disability. Using the FY05 budget expenses for instructional costs and indirect costs, a total annual cost for each placement was calculated. The annual cost was divided by number of students in each placement category as of December 1, 2004 to arrive at an estimated annual per pupil cost per placement.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Ten sets of findings are presented in this chapter. These analyses have been included to answer the following questions posed by the Board of Education:

1. What does research indicate is “best practice” in provision of services to students with a diagnosis of mental retardation in the area of literacy?
2. How are the students with a diagnosis of mental retardation provided literacy instruction in the SSD schools and in Partner Districts?
3. How do we measure progress in the area of literacy for students with mental retardation?
4. What types of progress are we making in the area of literacy with students that have a diagnosis of mental retardation?

The sets of findings are listed below, along with the number corresponding to the evaluation focus question related to the finding.

1. An analysis of the available demographic data.
2. Quality indicators derived from the literature review. (BOE question 1)
3. The results of the teacher and administrator surveys of quality indicators. (BOE questions 2)
4. An analysis of the teacher survey on measuring progress for the MR population. (BOE question 3)
5. Analysis of supports used and needed for students with MR.
6. Analysis of the IEP review and progress monitoring results. (BOE question 4)
7. Analyses of the type of progress made and MAP data. (BOE questions 4)
8. Results of the parent survey and analysis of comments.
9. The results of the public forum.
10. A cost analysis.

Demographic Data

Demographic information for this report was obtained from the December 1, 2004 Student Count. Census data was gathered by home district and attending district. Attending district data was reported by gender, ethnicity and grade level. As of the census date 12/1/04, 1,374 students with mental retardation received services from Special School District. Figure 1 depicts the
placement level of students with mental retardation receiving services through Special School District.

Figure 1.

![SSD Student Placement](image)

Student Count Data by attending district has been disaggregated by gender, ethnicity and grade. Figure 2 depicts the number of males and females who are diagnosed with mental retardation and receive services through SSD.

Figure 2.

![SSD Students by Gender](image)
Figure 3 disaggregates students with mental retardation by ethnicity.

**Figure 3.**

![SSD Students by Ethnicity](image)

Additional demographic information can be found in Appendix 2.

**Mental Retardation Quality Indicators**

*BOE Question 1: What does research indicate is “best practice” in provision of services to students with a diagnosis of MR in the area of literacy?*

The committee reviewed professional literature and developed the quality indicators of best practice in the area of literacy. The indicators were used to serve as a basis for development of the staff and administrator surveys. The committee utilized input from a variety of sources and relied heavily on information from the National Reading Panel, especially for the framework for instructional content. This information is summarized as follows:
### Table 3. Quality Indicators for Literacy Instruction

1. Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness)
2. Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction)
3. Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency)
4. Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary)
5. Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension)
6. Use knowledge of students to design educational experience
7. Provide for student and adult interactions in planned literacy activities
8. Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting
9. Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills
10. Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment
11. Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation
12. Utilize multiple strategies/methods in literacy instruction
13. Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent (GLE), Show-Me Standards)
14. Have high expectation for students with mental retardation
Teacher surveys were returned by 233 of the 320 SSD teachers who had 2 or more MR students on their caseload, yielding a 73% return rate. Of those teachers returning the survey, the majority (46%) work in elementary settings, 18% work in middle schools and 36% work in high schools. There were responses from SSD teachers in 23 school districts, and five SSD schools. There were no students diagnosed MR in technical education schools. Half of the responding teachers (49%) indicated they have students with mental retardation who are placed in special education more than 60% of the school day.

The survey indicates our teachers are highly qualified and experienced in the field of education. A majority (52%) of teachers have a master’s degree plus coursework as well as a majority of them (63%) having 11 years or more experience in education, with 58% of them having 11 years or more of this experience in special education. The average number of certifications in education is 3. The highest majority of teachers (58%) have certification in the area of learning disabilities; followed by mentally handicapped (56%), then BD/ED (52%) and elementary education, grades 1-6 (52%).

There were 59 items on the staff survey. The ratings were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing strongly disagree and a rating of 5 denoting strongly agree. Overall, the staff indicated they agreed or strongly agreed the majority of quality indicators on the survey (14 areas) are present and implemented in their programs. There were seven areas of strength on the items surveyed for which scores were at or above a 4.0 average. The strengths are noted in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have high expectation for students with mental retardation</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use knowledge of students to design educational experience</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize multiple strategies/methods in literacy instruction</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent, Show-Me Standards)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were five indicators for which the average scores were still above average, but fell below
3.9. These areas are considered progressing. They are itemized in Table 5. There were no items below the average of 3.4, which were considered challenges.

Table 5. Progressing Areas on Teacher Survey (mean between 3.5 – 3.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area of progressing, several of the items are related to literacy content. Results of the survey revealed 83% of teachers indicated they received adequate training to teach reading effectively and 77% indicated they received adequate training to teach writing effectively.

The teacher surveys were analyzed to determine if there were differences among grade levels. The elementary teachers have the highest rating in all indicators, following by middle school teachers, then high school teachers. Specific results can be found in Appendix 5-2. For two of the fourteen areas, ratings from high school teachers were below 3.0. These results are noted in Table 6.

Table 6. Teacher Surveys: Comparison Across Grade Levels (mean between 2.8 – 4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Elementary (E)</th>
<th>Middle School (M)</th>
<th>High School (H)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>E&gt;M&gt;H *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>E&gt;M&gt;H *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p <.05. There are statistically significant differences among school level.

One of the possibility for the low scores in middle schools and high schools is that phonemic awareness and phonics instruction are introduced at an early age in schools. When students reach
middle or high school, emphasis is often beyond phonemic awareness and phonics instruction, and more on fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. However, fluency and text comprehension are in the area of progressing (Table 5). In addition, assistive technology also in the area of progressing, indicating it is not fully utilized by teachers. We do not know whether students do not need the assistive technology, teachers are not aware of the availability of assistive technology, or teachers do not have the knowledge to implement assistive technology for their students who may benefit from its use.

The Administrator Observation Checklist was sent to 69 SSD area coordinators and SSD principals who have teachers with 2 or more students with mental retardation on their caseload. Each area coordinator and principal filled out 2 checklists for 2 of their teachers based on the evidence coordinators/principals gathered from observation, from the students, parents, educational staff, meetings and conversation. Of the 138 surveys distributed to administrators, 84 surveys were returned (69*2=138), yielding a 61% return rate. There were responses from administrators from 21 school districts and five SSD schools. The items on the administrator checklist are exactly the same as instructional information on the teacher survey. The purpose of having the teacher survey and administrator observation checklist is to examine whether there are discrepancies between teachers’ perceptions and their supervisor’s perceptions of teachers implementing literacy skills. Results can be found in Appendix 5-1.

There were several significant differences in the ratings between teachers and administrators. Table 7 displays the areas that are different between these two groups. The administrative group has the mean below 4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize multiple strategies/methods in literacy instruction</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent, Show-Me Standards)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/Your teacher received adequate training to teach reading effectively</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/Your teacher received adequate training to teach writing effectively</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p <.05. There are statistically significant differences among school level.

The difference in perceptions between administrators and teachers may be due to discrepancies in the expectations of each group. The results of the above data have clear implications in the areas of both the process for clarifying teacher instructional expectations as well as professional training needs for teacher level staff in the future.
The teacher survey was also utilized to determine how reading and writing instruction is being provided to students with mental retardation. Teachers were asked to indicate where reading instruction takes place and the average number of minutes per week reading instruction is provided. Eighty-one percent of the teachers indicated they provided direct reading instruction to the students on their caseload who have a diagnosis of mental retardation. Of these, 72% indicated they spend 150 minutes or more per week providing direct reading instruction. Eight percent of the teachers indicated their students receive direct reading instruction in the general education classroom without special education support. Twelve percent of the teachers indicated their students receive direct reading instruction in the general education setting with para educator support and 11% indicated their students receive direct reading instruction in a collaborative teaching or class within a class setting.

Teachers were also asked to indicate the literacy skills focused on during instruction. Table 8 displays the amount of focus given to the targeted skills. Less than half of the teachers indicated fluency is a focus skill of their reading instruction. This data is consistent with information found in the literature review. The literature indicated a majority of teachers do not focus on fluency skills as frequently as decoding and comprehension. It is a skill teachers often feel can wait until decoding and comprehension improve. However, the literature indicates fluency should and can be a skill continually focused on through modeling and strategy use.

Table 8. Focus of Literacy Skills Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoding</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers were asked to indicate the instructional methods and strategies used in direct reading instruction. Table 9 displays the top five strategies/methods used. These strategies were found to be among the best practices in current literature.

Table 9. Top 5 Strategies/Methods Utilized During Reading Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight word instruction</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned opportunities for modeled reading</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonetic Instruction</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned interactions with adults/peers in literacy activities</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Analysis</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee was also interested in the type of materials used in reading instruction. Table 10 displays the primary types of instructional materials utilized by teachers.
Similar questions were asked of the teachers regarding writing instruction. Eighty-two percent of the teachers indicated they provide direct writing instruction to the students on their caseloads who have a diagnosis of mental retardation. Of these teachers 76% indicated they spend between 80 and 350 minutes per week in writing instruction. Ninety-nine percent of the teachers reported instruction takes place in the special education setting. This reflects information found in the literature review, which indicated students with mental retardation make slow progress with the need for a lot of modeling and repetition. This type of instruction is often done in smaller groups and at a slower pace in the special education setting. The teachers were also asked to indicate how writing instruction is provided and 55% indicated writing instruction is an embedded part of their reading instruction. Table 11 displays the types of material being used for instruction in writing.

Table 11. Materials Used in Writing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher made materials</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial materials</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner District</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOE Question #3: How do we measure progress for the MR population?

There were 5 questions we asked teachers and administrators regarding measuring progress for their students with mental retardation. Table 12 displays the detail information.

Table 12. Progress Measuring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/Your teacher track students’ progress in the area of literacy</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/My teacher change or modify my/her instruction based on the results of student assessment data.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although time consuming, I/my teacher perceive data analysis as valuable component of student achievement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/My teacher am/is comfortable analyzing student assessment data</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/My teacher need additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p <.05. There are statistically significant differences between teachers and administrators.

Teachers indicated they used various measures to track students’ progress. The measures teachers used to track students’ progress are consistent with what their supervisors observed. The top 5 are as followed:

1. IEP goals/bench marks (92%)
2. Student work samples (81%)
3. Pre-post testing (81%)
4. Classroom grades (47%)
5. Reading inventories (i.e., IRI, QRI) (40%)

Teachers indicated they change their instruction based on student assessment data; however, administrators observed that their teachers did so at a lesser degree than their teachers’ self report. It is the same situation in perceiving data analysis as a valuable component of student achievement. Teachers indicated they are comfortable analyzing student assessment data, therefore less than half of teachers (48%) indicated they need additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy. However, administrators observed their teachers are not as comfortable in analyzing student assessment data. Fifty –seven percent of administrators said their teachers need additional staff development.
Support Used and Needed for Students with Mental Retardation

We asked teachers and administrators to indicate the support or resources teachers used or needed for students with mental retardation. Table 13 displays the top 5 supports teachers state are used and needed most. Table 14 displays the top 5 supports administrators observed their teachers used and needed most. Teachers and administrators are consistent in the supports teachers used most—adaptations/modifications, repetition, slower pace, and materials support. The greatest support teachers indicated is needed is materials support, followed by instructional technology/software and assistive technology support. The supports administrators indicated their teachers needed most are staff development, learning strategies for reading, and instructional technology/software.

The percentages on the needed column are much less than the percentages on the used column. This may indicate the supports teachers needed could enhance their jobs and provide better instructional environments for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports Used</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Supports Needed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/Modification</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Materials support</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Instructional technology/Software</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower pace</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Staff development/Training</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials support</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Assistive technology support</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning strategies for reading</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Learning strategies for reading</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Administrator Observation Checklist: Top 5 Supports Administrator Observed That Their Teachers Used and Needed Most (rank from highest %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports Used</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Supports Needed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/Modification</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Staff development/Training</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower pace</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Learning strategies for reading</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials support</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Instructional technology/Software</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Materials support</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to utilizing the surveys to determine the supports needed for literacy instruction, a working committee of teachers representing districts within each region and the various school-age levels was used to gather further teacher perceptions and recommendations. The teachers indicated the need for more training involving literacy instruction for students with mental retardation. The group suggested the training should include the following:
• Planning individualized, differentiated literacy instruction
• Issues and awareness of literacy instruction at the secondary level
• Methods for collecting and analyzing data towards student progress and data based decision making for instruction
• Approaches to writing measurable and achievable literacy goals for students with mental retardation

The group further suggested these trainings include follow-up to ensure carry-over of skills into the school setting. The teachers also felt there is a need for more exposure to technology resources with a support system in place for training and updating of current technology.
**IEP File Review and Progress Monitoring**

The committee reviewed 82 files representing each of the four geographic regions, 23 partner districts and the five SSD schools, as well as elementary and secondary age levels serving students with mental retardation. There were 17% of the files representing SSD schools and 84% from partner districts. Of the files reviewed, 49% were from elementary schools, 19% from middle schools, and 32% from high schools. In terms of the level of placement, 3% of the files were <21% of day outside regular class, 33% of files were 21-60% outside regular class, 47% of files were >60% of day outside regular class, and 17% of files were from SSD schools. In these 82 files, 100% contained one or more literacy goals.

The committee established criterion for file review as follows: 1) literacy goals included any goal/s related to listening, speaking, reading, and writing, 2) the current and immediately prior IEPs were utilized for each file to examine progress on previous goals as evidence for same could be found in either evaluation of goals pages (Form 3b) or present level in current IEP, 3) no limit on number of literacy goals, and 4) results were tabulated in only 3 categories (goal met, goal not met, or no evidence.) If an IEP goal was marked or described as progressing it was marked in the not met category.

**Progress on IEP Goals**

Data was collected from 82 student files examining progress on IEP goals. There were a total of 269 literacy goals for these 82 students. The average number of goals per student was 3. When the committee saw documented evidence of a goal met, they marked it as “met”. When the goal was not met or marked as progressing, the committee tabbed the goal as “not met”. When there was no evidence of any progress toward the literacy goal, the committee marked the goal as “no evidence”. Of the 269 goals examined, 30% of goals were noted as met, 46% of goals were not met, and 24% of goals had no evidence in terms of progress. Table 15 shows the results for the progress on IEP goals examined.

**Table 15. Progress on IEP Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Goals =269</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met (Progressing)</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Goals (100%)</td>
<td>80 (30%)</td>
<td>124 (46%)</td>
<td>65 (24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are also interested in knowing the difference among school levels in terms of literacy goals under the categories of Met, Not Met, and No Evidence. Under the category of Goal Met, elementary schools have the highest percentage. Under the category of Goal Not Met, middle schools have the highest percentage. Under the category of No Evidence, high schools have the highest percentage on students’ goal progress.

In the Category of Not Met, we would like to note two factors. The rationale for including goals, which had “progressed”, in this Not Met rating was based on the committee not being able to determine, in almost all cases, where this “progress” status was along the continuum. Was there minimum or maximum progress? In some cases a student may have been only a few percentage points from meeting his or her goal. The new ENCORE system does allow for text to be included on such information if utilized by the case manager after the first time this system is implemented on a student. The second factor to be noted is the goal writing in IEPs. Suffice it to say that when goals are too broad as opposed to specific, they are less likely to be met in the time limited period specified.
### Table 16. Progress on IEP Goals Across School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Goals (N)</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met (Progressing)</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td>50 (33%)</td>
<td>67 (45%)</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>46 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>23 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
<td>17 (23%)</td>
<td>34 (47%)</td>
<td>22 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 5.

**Literacy Goals from MR IEP File Review**

- **Elementary School**
- **Middle School**
- **High School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of literacy goals</td>
<td>% of literacy goals</td>
<td>% of literacy goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOE Question #4: What types of progress are we making with students that have a diagnosis of MR?

**Type of Progress Made**

In their survey, we asked teachers if students were making progress and what kind of behavioral changes students have made in the area of literacy. Teachers indicated the behavioral changes they observed most were word knowledge (75%), reading for a purpose (63%), reading for pleasure (58%), activating prior knowledge (57%), and writing for a purpose (46%). This information is also consistent with administrators’ observation.

**MAP Data**

Results of the Communication Arts section were reviewed for all students with mental retardation in St. Louis County who took the Missouri Assessment Program over the last five years. Results have been reported for the years 2000 to 2004. The following tables and figures depict the results for the 3rd, 7th, and 11th grade Communication Arts test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>LND #</th>
<th>LND%</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th>N.Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>St Louis Co. MR Index</th>
<th>St Louis County SpEd Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>174.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>179.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>132.9</td>
<td>184.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>180.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>185.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.
Table 18. Communication Arts, Gr. 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>LND #</th>
<th>LND%</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>N. Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>St Louis Co. MR Index</th>
<th>St. Louis SpEd Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>113.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>104.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>108.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.
Table 19. Communication Arts, Gr. 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>LND #</th>
<th>LND%</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th>N.Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>St Louis Co. MR Index</th>
<th>St. Louis County SpEd Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>131.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>140.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>137.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>151.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.

The percentage of students in Level Not Determined has decreased at the 3rd grade level over the past five years. There are no consistent trends for Level Not Determined at the 7th or 11th grade levels. The index scores for Communication Arts at the 3rd, 7th and 11th grade levels are lower for the population of students diagnosed with mental retardation in St. Louis County when compared to the entire special education population in St. Louis County. This is an anticipated difference because the entire special education population includes students who may be functioning at a higher cognitive level. This MAP data does not provide meaningful information for use in analysis of student progress and instructional planning. Item analysis of MAP data for individual students would be more beneficial, but was not available to the committee.
Parent Surveys

Parent climate surveys were sent to all SSD families, including those with a child with an educational diagnosis of mental retardation. This latter group included 1,397 parents / guardians, who were on the district’s information database as of April 2005. Surveys were returned from 176 families, yielding a 13% return rate. There were responses from families in 21 school districts and the SSD schools. Fifty-seven percent of the parents that responded indicated their child receives special education more than 60% of the school day.

There were 16 items on the parent survey. The ratings were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing strongly disagree and a rating of 5 denoting strongly agree. There were no items for which the parents’ score was below 3.0. There was one item that was designed to measure parents overall satisfaction with services. Table 20 depicts the results.

Table 20. Overall Parent Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the special education teacher meets the needs of my child</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top six areas of strength from the parent surveys rated at or above a 4.0. Table 21 depicts the strengths.

Table 21. Strength Areas on Parent Survey (mean of 4.0 and above)

| Indicator                                                      | Mean |
|                                                               |      |
| The special education teachers show respect for my child       | 4.5  |
| I am welcome to discuss my child’s special education needs with the special education staff | 4.5  |
| I support my child’s learning at home                         | 4.5  |
| I respect the school’s special education teacher              | 4.4  |
| I am informed about my child’s progress by his/her special education teacher | 4.2  |
| I know what my child’s special education teacher expects of my child | 4.2  |

There were four indicators for which the score was still above average (3.0), but fell below 4.0. These areas are considered progressing. Table 22 depicts the results. The lowest rated item (score 3.7) was asking parents whether there is a lot of teamwork between special education and general education staff.
Table 22. Progressing Areas on Parent Survey (mean between 3.7 – 3.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The special education teacher/special education school meets the social needs of my child</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The special education teacher helps me to help my child learn at home</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School District has a good public image</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lot of teamwork between special education and general education staff</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked parents what Special School District should continue to do. After the content analyses of parents’ comments, the top three categories are (a) positive in providing services and support, (b) inclusion and integration, and (c) working effectively with partner district personnel.

Examples:

**Overall positive in providing services and support.**
- Continue providing excellent education and support.
- Provide the services needed by special needs students.

**Inclusion and integration.**
- Use the total inclusion model in preschool thru elementary. This promotes socialization, language development and develops readiness for classroom appropriate behaviors.
- Should continue to support the students and help integrate them into the regular school community.

**Working effectively with partner district personnel.**
- Work cooperatively with general education teachers and administrators. Work to improve communications and relationships between parents and teachers/staff.
- Encourage site principals to allow for team collaboration between the general ed. teachers and the special ed. team. Good communication, teamwork and open minds are the key to success.

We also asked parents what Special School District should stop doing. The top three categories are (a) “nothing”, (b) needs of improvement, and (c) inclusion and placement.

Examples:

**Parent’s highest response was that we should stop “Nothing.”**
- Nothing!
- Not much
- Not aware of anything
Needs of improvement
- Starting the school year unprepared (i.e. short TA’s).
- Stop having the aide (with no specialized training) adapt/modify the curriculum. Teachers should be responsible for curriculum.
- Coming to meeting not prepared, not knowing what’s really going on, not providing information to parents when being asked. Stop talking to parents as though they have a disability.
- Writing IEP’s then running the classroom without following them.
- Sending Administrators to IEP’s with single-minded agenda to reduce services.

Inclusion and placement
- Sending kids to “Special Schools” when that child could be serviced in the home school with the proper supports.
- Having extremely difficult behavior students in Phase 2. Their needs can’t be met. Teachers and assistants are merely housing. They can’t teach!
- Students should be allowed to go to Phase 3 if parent desires. Combining classes. BD students should not be with MR. They tease them too much.
- They should stop grouping students together because they are in the same grade, but group together with similar abilities.
- Segregation of Special Ed. Students.

We also asked parents what Special School District should start to do. The top four categories are (a) IEPs, (b) improving SSD’s image in the community, (c) in general education in the area of communication to improve student achievement, and (d) social instruction.

Examples:
Parents’ highest response was in the area of IEPs
- Organize team meetings for staff and families.
- Being more informative on each child’s progress.
- Better defining a plan for a child’s education that results in a targeted end result or goal.
- Start treating parents as if they are an important part of the IPE and acknowledge when mistakes are made.

Improving SSD’s image in the community
- Highlight a child’s story history, goals, successes in publication, or a teacher’s story history, goals, or successes.
- Advertise SSD’s successes, the public doesn’t understand what a wonderful job SSD does!
- Be more in the public eye.
Work toward educating the public on the new Governor’s policies and their impact on people with special needs.

In general education, in the area of “Communication” to improve student achievement

- More communication between SSD and school staff. SSD could work on weak areas if informed.
- Strengthen communication skills between general education and special education to further support regular classroom work
- General education teachers need to team better with special education teachers i.e., on curriculum goals and adaptations, low academic expectations from regular classroom teachers without special education input.

Social Instruction

- I would like to see social groups for kids with similar needs. So they could have some friends in and out of school.
- Start after school activities for special needs children.
- My son needs social skills, 3 or 4 kids in small groups to show how to interact with each other i.e., playing, talking, eating, etc.

Public Forum

One person participated in the public forum opportunity provided. She was a speech-language pathologist working at the secondary level in a partner school district. The following summarizes the observational and perceptual feedback she provided:

- Limited learning occurs with the older students with mental retardation.

- Many parents encountered have limited education and are in the lower socioeconomic echelon. This translates often to a lack of parental support in providing a literacy rich environment.

- Some teachers don’t believe students with mental retardation can learn or have low expectations.

- Teachers of students with mental retardation need to be trained in literacy. A lot more training needs to occur as many teachers give up thinking there is a point to the instruction.

- Teachers don’t have enough pre-service training in areas needed due to cross-categorical certification.
Cost Analysis

The most expensive service for students with a diagnosis of mental retardation is provided in our special school district buildings. The annual cost per pupil based on student numbers from the district’s 2004 unduplicated December 1 Count was $30,780. There were 302 students in our district building count at that time. The next highest cost category were those students (633) in our partner district buildings who received special education minutes for 60% or more of their school day. The average annual per pupil cost was $25,956. Following this were those students with services between 21-60% of their school day (317) with an annual per pupil cost of $14,184. The final level of service provided for students with mental retardation were those with special education minutes for up to 21% of their school day (111). Their annual per pupil cost was $11,520. According to the teachers sub work group and current practice in many partner districts, students with mental retardation who have a greater level of inclusion often have the support of a para-educator. This support may come in the form of partial day support for an individual student or being pared with several students having special needs in a regular education class where a teacher assistant is assigned for a specified class or period of time. The higher cost per students who receive service in a separate school facility in the District takes into consideration factors such as smaller class size, need for more assistive technology, maintenance and upkeep of building facilities and greater staffing patterns, including those in specialized disciplines. Generally, those students with mental retardation programmed for in the special school district buildings have the most significant needs.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The program evaluation committee met to review the data collected, assimilate findings, and analyze these findings to determine strengths and weaknesses. The following strengths and weaknesses were noted across multiple data sources.

Strengths

Several areas of strength were identified. Parents indicated overall satisfaction with their child’s special education teacher. Parents reported they are informed of their child’s progress and are welcome to discuss their child’s educational needs with the special education staff. They also noted the special education staff show respect for their child. Parents additionally indicated they support their child’s learning at home. The latter was found in the literature to be important in the development of literacy skills for students with mental retardation.

Several instructional strengths were noted as well. As reported by teacher and observed by area coordinators, teachers have high expectations for students with mental retardation and use knowledge of students to design lessons. Teachers provide a literacy rich environment for their students. It was found teachers teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge. The biggest behavior change noted by teachers was an increase in their students’ word knowledge. This is consistent with the literature review, which indicates word knowledge is important for students in order to enhance daily living and job skills.

Strengths were also found in the teachers’ use of adaptation/modifications, repetition and slower pacing as supports for students with mental retardation. These supports were reflected through both the teacher survey and administrator observation checklist.

During the IEP review, it was found that 100% of the IEPs reviewed contained literacy goals. There was an average of three goals per student. This indicated we are focusing on literacy skills with the students who have a diagnosis of mental retardation and this focus is being maintained across grade levels to some degree.

Weaknesses

The program evaluation found three main areas of challenge.
Training/Support
Both teachers and area coordinators indicated the need for additional training in the areas of learning strategies for reading and writing instruction specifically tailored to the population they teach. Staff also reported a need for increased support and access to instructional resources and materials to support literacy instruction. These areas of challenge were reflected in the teacher survey, administrator observation checklist and feedback from the sub work group comprised of special education teachers. The teacher survey and administrator observation checklist also revealed a discrepancy between the teachers’ perception of their literacy instruction and the expectations of the administrators.

Technology Support
Teachers indicated the need for more awareness of assistive and instructional technology that can be used with students with mental retardation during literacy instruction. Teachers also expressed the need for more support in accessing and using technology. This was revealed through the teacher survey and input from the teacher sub work group.

Progress Monitoring
The IEP review indicated weaknesses in the measurement and documentation of progress on IEP goals. Analysis of grade level MAP data for monitoring progress of individual students was also found to be a weakness.

Limitations
The information collected provided the committee with a significant amount of data not been previously reviewed and analyzed by the district for the population of students with mental retardation. However, in the process of gathering this information the committee noted several limitations, which should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of the study.

1. The research in the area of literacy and students with disabilities, especially the population diagnosed with mental retardation, is severely limited.

2. Many of the studies found were research based but few were research validated. Populations utilized in these same studies were relatively small and were not longitudinal in nature.

3. The length of time allocated for completion for a study of this magnitude was relatively short.

4. The timing for staff participating on committees was restrictive due to timelines for major activities in the study conflicting with end of school year responsibilities.
5. Due to time and resource limitations the committee was unable, on an extensive basis, to examine the discrepancy between teacher perceptions of progress monitoring and the committee’s IEP file review.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations address the areas of weakness revealed through the program evaluation. Recommendations have been made in the areas of training/support, technology support and progress monitoring. Action plans have been developed to address these recommendations.

1. Provide training for best practices in literacy instruction including learning strategies and instructional resources. Considerations should include differentiated training for elementary and secondary staff as well as student ability level, in order to address the specific needs of the population.

2. Ensure that staff is aware of MSIP standards and best practice requirements for a specified amount of instructional minutes in literacy for students including those with mental retardation.

3. Provide training opportunities for use of consistent and meaningful data collection and progress monitoring to guide instructional planning as it relates to literacy. Considerations should include goal writing and progress reporting procedures through the IEP process.

4. Require staff to record percentages on IEP goal evaluation for each reporting period throughout the duration of annual IEP.

5. Increase administrator and staff awareness of resources and process to access assistive technology and instructional software for use in literacy instruction.

6. Utilize the current Performance Based Evaluation process to clarify administrator expectations of instructional staff regarding skill sets as they relate to literacy instruction for the population of students with mental retardation.

7. MAP data should be analyzed, to provide an additional source of data, using item analysis for individual students to assist teachers in instructional planning for literacy instruction.


National Reading Panel. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read*. National Institute of Child Health & Human Development, NIH, DHHS.
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SSD Services for Students with mental Retardation
## Program Definition

### Special School District Services for Students with Mental Retardation (Census Date 12/1/2004)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004-2005 School Year</th>
<th>Central Region</th>
<th>North Region</th>
<th>South Region</th>
<th>West Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total St. Louis County</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>U. City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>Normaly</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>plankton</td>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. City</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Central Region</td>
<td>Total North Region</td>
<td>Total South Region</td>
<td>Total West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferg/Flor</td>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverview Gardens</td>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>Maplewood/Rhodesberg</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>Valley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Region</td>
<td>North Region</td>
<td>South Region</td>
<td>West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students served in SSD with Mental Retardation</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students served in SSD with Mental Retardation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Education Early Childhood Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Itinerant Service outside the Home</th>
<th>Early Childhood Setting</th>
<th>Early Childhood Special Education Setting</th>
<th>Separate School</th>
<th>Part Time EC/Part Time ECSE Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Education School Age Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Regular Class less than 21% of day***</th>
<th>Outside Regular Class 21-60%</th>
<th>Outside Regular Class more than 60%</th>
<th>Separate Facility-Private (POS)</th>
<th>Separate Facility-Public (SSD Schools)</th>
<th>Homebound/Hospital</th>
<th>Public Residential Facility (Court Programs)</th>
<th>Career Training Program</th>
<th>Special Non-Public After School Program (SNAP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clarifying notes:

- Data from SSD Student database.
- "Other includes tuition students and non local students.
- **Data from Teacher Level Satisfaction Survey 2004."I am satisfied with the responsiveness with SSD staff and administration to questions and/or concerns" is a 5-point Likert scale with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 5 meaning strongly agree.
- ***Data from Parent Satisfaction Survey 2004."I am satisfied with the responsiveness with SSD staff and administration to questions and/or concerns" is a 5-point Likert scale with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 5 meaning strongly agree.
- Technical Education students with an educational disability have been included in their home school district.

Office of Program Evaluation
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APPENDIX 2-2

SSD Students with Mental Retardation
By Gender, Ethnicity and Grade Level
## Attending District

### Special School District Students with Mental Retardation December 1, 2004

#### Student Count by Gender, Ethnicity, and Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affton</th>
<th>Bayless</th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Clayton</th>
<th>Ferg./Flor.</th>
<th>Hancock Place</th>
<th>Hazelwood</th>
<th>Jennings</th>
<th>Kirkwood</th>
<th>Ladue</th>
<th>Lindbergh</th>
<th>Mehlville</th>
<th>MRH</th>
<th>Normandy</th>
<th>Parkway</th>
<th>Pattonville</th>
<th>Private Separate</th>
<th>Parkview</th>
<th>Riverview Gardens</th>
<th>Rockwood</th>
<th>University City</th>
<th>Valley Park</th>
<th>Webster Groves</th>
<th>Wellston</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>AMER IND</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3-1

Area Coordinator Observation Checklist
This Observation Checklist is part of the Mental Retardation Program Evaluation and is intended to assess teachers in implementing quality instruction for students with mental retardation. Please complete TWO Observation Checklists on 2 separate teachers based on the evidence you gathered from observations, non observed data from the students, parents, education staff, and community members, drop-in visits, conferences, staff meetings, and conversations. Please return TWO completed Observation Checklists to Chialin Hsieh, Program Evaluation at SSD CO by Pony, by May 20, 2005. You may contact Paulette Bolazina, Chair of the program evaluation with questions at 314.989.8375.

**Demographic Information**

1. This teacher of students with mental retardation mainly works in (check all that apply)
   - [ ] Cross categorical resource room teacher
   - [ ] Self-contained cross categorical classroom teacher in a partner district
   - [ ] SSD school teacher
   - [ ] Other ____________

2. This teacher works at
   - [ ] Elementary school
   - [ ] Middle school
   - [ ] High school

3. This teacher I supervise is from
   - [ ] Affton
   - [ ] Clayton
   - [ ] Hazelwood
   - [ ] Ladue
   - [ ] Mehlville
   - [ ] Pattonville
   - [ ] Rockwood
   - [ ] Webster Groves
   - [ ] Technical education school
   - [ ] Bayless
   - [ ] Ferguson-Florissant
   - [ ] Jennings
   - [ ] Lindbergh
   - [ ] Normandy
   - [ ] Ritenour
   - [ ] University City
   - [ ] Wellston
   - [ ] Brentwood
   - [ ] Hancock Place
   - [ ] Kirkwood
   - [ ] Maplewood Richmond Heights
   - [ ] Parkway
   - [ ] Riverview Gardens
   - [ ] Valley Park
   - [ ] Special education school

Rate the degree to which you currently have evidence to support that the teacher is implementing the following skills in his/her classroom for students with mental retardation? If you have not had the opportunity to observe the teacher implementing the following skills, please darken the "NA" for not applicable.

**Quality Instruction in the Area of Literacy**

**Response Definition:** N=Not at all  L=Limited  M=Moderate  O=Often  A=Always  NA=Not applicable

4. Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness). .................................................................
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] O
   - [ ] M
   - [ ] L
   - [ ] N
   - [ ] NA

5. Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction). .................................................................
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] O
   - [ ] M
   - [ ] L
   - [ ] N
   - [ ] NA

6. Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency). .................................................................
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] O
   - [ ] M
   - [ ] L
   - [ ] N
   - [ ] NA

7. Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary). .................................................................
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] O
   - [ ] M
   - [ ] L
   - [ ] N
   - [ ] NA

8. Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension). .................................................................
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] O
   - [ ] M
   - [ ] L
   - [ ] N
   - [ ] NA
9. Text comprehension instruction strategies are provided in the following manners: (Darken all that apply)

- Comprehension monitoring
- Use of graphic and semantic organizers
- Question generation
- Summarization
- Cooperative learning
- Question answering
- Story structure
- Not applicable or None

**Response Definition: N=Not at all   L=Limited   M= Moderate   O=Often   A=Always   NA=Not applicable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Use knowledge of students to design educational experience.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide for student and adult interactions in planned literacy activities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent (GLE), Show-Me Standards)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Have high expectation for students with MR.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The teacher received adequate training to teach reading effectively.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The teacher received adequate training to teach writing effectively.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective supports or resources for your students with mental retardation**

21. What effective supports or resources does the teacher use for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

- Administrative support
- Assistive technology support
- Materials support
- Facilitator support
- Instructional Resource Center (IRC)
- Parent/family support in literacy activities
- Time resources
- Slower pace
- Staff development/Training
- Instructional technology/Software
- Literacy rich environment
- Learning strategies for reading
- Partner district personnel support
- Adaptation/Modification
- Repetition
- Other

22. Additional comments on supports the teacher used.
23. What effective supports or resources does the teacher need for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

- Administrative support
- Assistive technology support
- Materials support
- Facilitator support
- Instructional Resource Center (IRC)
- Parent/family support in literacy activities
- Time resources
- Slower pace
- Staff development/Training
- Instructional technology/Software
- Literacy rich environment
- Learning strategies for reading
- Partner district personnel support
- Adaptation/Modification
- Repetition
- Other

24. Additional comments on supports the teacher needs.

25. This teacher tracks students' progress in the area of literacy.................................

26. This teacher utilizes the following (student assessment data) of literacy assessment to measure/track students' progress (darken all that apply).

- IEP goal(s)/benchmarks
- Formal testing (i.e., Woodcock Johnson)
- Reading inventories (i.e., IRI, QRI)
- Observations
- Parent interviews
- MAP or MAP-A
- Classroom grades
- Student work samples
- Pre-post testing
- Checklists
- District standardized test(s)
- Other

27. This teacher is comfortable analyzing student assessment data...........................................

28. This teacher changes/modifies his/her instruction based on the results of student assessment data........

29. Although time consuming, this teacher views data analysis as valuable component of student achievement..........................................................

30. This teacher needs additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy.....

31. If teacher's students are making progress, what kind of behavior changes have students made in the area of literacy? (Darken all that apply)

- Students are engaged in meaningful literacy activities:
  - Activating prior knowledge
  - Word knowledge
  - Reading for a purpose
  - Writing for a purpose
  - Reading for pleasure
  - Other
APPENDIX 3-2

Area Coordinator Observation Checklist Results
1. This teacher of students with mental retardation mainly works in (check all that apply)

- Cross categorical resource room teacher: 20 (24%)
- Self-contained cross categorical classroom...: 55 (67%)
- SSD school teacher: 8 (10%)
- Other: 3 (4%)

Total Responses: 82

2. This teacher works at

- Elementary school: 38 (48%)
- Middle school: 19 (24%)
- High school: 23 (29%)

Total Responses: 80

3. This teacher I supervise is from

- Aftton: 2 (2%)
- Bayless: 1 (1%)
- Brentwood: 0 (0%)
- Clayton: 0 (0%)
- Ferguson-Florissant: 6 (7%)
- Hancock Place: 2 (2%)
- Hazelwood: 7 (8%)
- Jennings: 0 (0%)
- Kirkwood: 4 (5%)
- Ladue: 3 (4%)
- Lindbergh: 2 (2%)
- Maplewood Richmond Heights: 1 (1%)
- Mehlville: 7 (8%)
- Normandy: 2 (2%)
- Parkway: 11 (13%)
- Pattonville: 4 (5%)
- Ritenour: 2 (2%)
- Riverview Gardens: 6 (7%)
- Rockwood: 12 (14%)
- University City: 2 (2%)
- Webster Groves: 1 (1%)
- Wellston: 2 (2%)
- Special education school: 5 (6%)
- Technical education school: 0 (0%)

Total Responses: 83
4. Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness).

1. Not at all 3 4%
2. Limited 7 8%
3. Moderate 26 31%
4. Often 19 23%
5. Always 24 29%
6. Not applicable 4 5%
Total Responses: 83
Mean: 3.68 Standard Deviation: 1.12

5. Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction).

1. Not at all 2 2%
2. Limited 8 10%
3. Moderate 18 22%
4. Often 24 29%
5. Always 27 33%
6. Not applicable 4 5%
Total Responses: 83
Mean: 3.84 Standard Deviation: 1.09

6. Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency).

1. Not at all 2 2%
2. Limited 10 12%
3. Moderate 19 23%
4. Often 24 29%
5. Always 21 25%
6. Not applicable 7 8%
Total Responses: 83
Mean: 3.68 Standard Deviation: 1.10

7. Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary).

1. Not at all 1 1%
2. Limited 0 0%
3. Moderate 17 21%
4. Often 25 30%
5. Always 36 44%
6. Not applicable 3 4%
Total Responses: 82
Mean: 4.20 Standard Deviation: 0.87
8. Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 83
Mean: 4.04 Standard Deviation: 0.96

9. Text comprehension instruction strategies are provided in the following manners: (Darken all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension monitoring</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of graphic and semantic organizers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question answering</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question generation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story structure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarization</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable or None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 78

10. Use knowledge of students to design educational experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 82
Mean: 4.28 Standard Deviation: 1.00

11. Provide for student and adult interactions in planned literacy activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 82
Mean: 4.09 Standard Deviation: 0.96
12. Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting.

1. Not at all 1%  
2. Limited 9%  
3. Moderate 20%  
4. Often 26%  
5. Always 44%  
6. Not applicable 1%  
Total Responses: 82  
Mean: 4.04 Standard Deviation: 1.05

13. Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills.

1. Not at all 2%  
2. Limited 5%  
3. Moderate 20%  
4. Often 37%  
5. Always 36%  
6. Not applicable 0%  
Total Responses: 81  
Mean: 3.99 Standard Deviation: 0.99
14. Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment.

1. Not at all 67%
2. Limited 16%
3. Moderate 24%
4. Often 32%
5. Always 21%
6. Not applicable 0%

Total Responses: 82
Mean: 3.43 Standard Deviation: 1.20

15. Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation.

1. Not at all 79%
2. Limited 11%
3. Moderate 24%
4. Often 29%
5. Always 17%
6. Not applicable 10%

Total Responses: 82
Mean: 3.39 Standard Deviation: 1.20


1. Not at all 22%
2. Limited 12%
3. Moderate 23%
4. Often 27%
5. Always 34%
6. Not applicable 11%

Total Responses: 82
Mean: 3.79 Standard Deviation: 1.13

17. Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent (GLE), Show-Me Standards)

1. Not at all 34%
2. Limited 11%
3. Moderate 20%
4. Often 32%
5. Always 33%
6. Not applicable 1%

Total Responses: 82
Mean: 3.80 Standard Deviation: 1.13
18. Have high expectation for students with MR.

1. Not at all 1 1%
2. Limited 7 9%
3. Moderate 12 15%
4. Often 16 20%
5. Always 44 54%
6. Not applicable 2 2%
Total Responses: 82
Mean: 4.19 Standard Deviation: 1.07

19. The teacher received adequate training to teach reading effectively.

1. Yes 53 65%
2. No 29 35%
Total Responses: 82
Mean: 1.35 Standard Deviation: 0.48

20. The teacher received adequate training to teach writing effectively.

1. Yes 51 62%
2. No 31 38%
Total Responses: 82
Mean: 1.38 Standard Deviation: 0.49
21. What effective supports or resources does the teacher use for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

- Administrative support
- Staff development/Training
- Assistive technology support
- Instructional technology/Software
- Materials support
- Literacy rich environment
- Facilitator support
- Learning strategies for reading
- Instructional Resource Center (IRC)
- Partner district personnel support
- Parent/family support in literacy activities
- Adaptation/Modification
- Time resources
- Repetition
- Slower pace
- Other

Total Responses: 82

23. What effective supports or resources does the teacher need for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

- Administrative support
- Staff development/Training
- Assistive technology support
- Instructional technology/Software
- Materials support
- Literacy rich environment
- Facilitator support
- Learning strategies for reading
- Instructional Resource Center (IRC)
- Partner district personnel support
- Parent/family support in literacy activities
- Adaptation/Modification
- Time resources
- Repetition
- Slower pace
- Other

Total Responses: 75

25. This teacher tracks students' progress in the area of literacy.

- Yes
- No

Total Responses: 71

Mean: 1.08 Standard Deviation: 0.28
26. This teacher utilizes the following (student assessment data) of literacy assessment to measure/track students’ progress (darken all that apply).

1. IEP goal(s)/Benchmarks 78 96%
2. Classroom grades 43 53%
3. Formal testing (i.e., Woodcock Johnson) 16 20%
4. Student work samples 67 83%
5. Reading inventories (i.e., IRI, QRI) 39 48%
6. Pre-post testing 38 47%
7. Observations 63 78%
8. Checklists 39 48%
9. Parent interviews 12 15%
10. District standardized test(s) 30 37%
11. MAP or MAP-A 40 49%
12. Other 4 5%

Total Responses: 81

27. This teacher is comfortable analyzing student assessment data.

1. Strongly Disagree 3 4%
2. Disagree 8 10%
3. Neutral 16 20%
4. Agree 36 45%
5. Strongly Agree 12 15%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 5 6%

Total Responses: 80

Mean: 3.61 Standard Deviation: 1.01

28. This teacher changes/modifies his/her instruction based on the results of student assessment data.

1. Strongly Disagree 3 4%
2. Disagree 6 8%
3. Neutral 8 10%
4. Agree 44 55%
5. Strongly Agree 17 21%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 2 2%

Total Responses: 80

Mean: 3.85 Standard Deviation: 0.98

29. Although time consuming, this teacher views data analysis as valuable component of student achievement.

1. Strongly Disagree 3 4%
2. Disagree 3 4%
3. Neutral 14 18%
4. Agree 41 52%
5. Strongly Agree 13 16%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 5 6%

Total Responses: 79

Mean: 3.78 Standard Deviation: 0.93
30. This teacher needs additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 3.47 Standard Deviation: 1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. If teacher's students are making progress, what kind of behavior changes have students made in the area of literacy? (Darken all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>activating prior knowledge</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word knowledge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading for a purpose</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing for a purpose</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading for pleasure</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4-1

Teacher Survey
You have received this survey because you have 2 or more students with mental retardation on your caseload. This survey is part of the Program Evaluation for students with mental retardation and is intended to assist the Special School District (SSD) in assessing the instructional supports in the area of literacy for students with mental retardation. Please complete the following survey for students with mental retardation for whom you are the teacher. Please return the survey by Pony mail to Dr. Chialin Hsieh, Program Evaluation at SSD CO by Pony, by May 20, 2005. You may contact Paulette Bolazina, Chair of the program evaluation with questions at 314.989.8375.

### Demographic Information

1. My role is (darken all that apply)
   - [ ] Cross categorical resource room teacher
   - [ ] Self-contained cross categorical classroom teacher in a partner district
   - [ ] SSD school teacher
   - [ ] Other ____________

2. I provide special education services in a collaborative teaching (CT) or class within a class (CWC) model.
   - [ ] Yes, Please list subject area(s)________
   - [ ] No

3. I primarily work in
   - [ ] Elementary school
   - [ ] Middle school
   - [ ] High school

4. What are the educational placements of the students with mental retardation you serve. (darken all that apply).
   - [ ] <21% of school day outside regular class
   - [ ] 21-60% of school day outside regular class
   - [ ] >60% of school day outside regular class
   - [ ] Public separate facility (SSD School)

5. What is the percentage of students on your caseload with mental retardation ?
   - [ ] less than 25% of students with MR
   - [ ] between 25% to 50% of students with MR
   - [ ] between 51% to 75% of students with MR
   - [ ] more than 75% of students with MR

6. What is the percentage of time you work with students with mental retardation?
   - [ ] less than 25%
   - [ ] 25% - 50%
   - [ ] 51% - 75%
   - [ ] more than 75%

7. I have a
   - [ ] Bachelor's degree
   - [ ] Bachelor's degree + courses
   - [ ] Master's degree + courses
   - [ ] Doctorate

8. The number of years I have worked in an educational setting is
   - [ ] less than 3 years
   - [ ] 3-5 years
   - [ ] 6-10 years
   - [ ] 11-15 years
   - [ ] 16-25 years
   - [ ] 26-35 years

9. The number of years I have worked in the special education area is
   - [ ] less than 3 years
   - [ ] 3-5 years
   - [ ] 6-10 years
   - [ ] 11-15 years
   - [ ] 16-25 years
   - [ ] 26-35 years

10. The number of years I have worked at Special School District is
    - [ ] less than 3 years
    - [ ] 3-5 years
    - [ ] 6-10 years
    - [ ] 11-15 years
    - [ ] 16-25 years
    - [ ] 26-35 years

11. The number of certification(s) or license(s) I have in education.
    - [ ] 1
    - [ ] 2
    - [ ] 3
    - [ ] 4
    - [ ] 5
    - [ ] 6 or more
Program Evaluation for Students with Mental Retardation

Teacher Survey

12. I have certification(s) or license(s) in (check all that apply)
   - Elementary Education--Early Childhood (B-3)
   - Elementary Education--1-6
   - Middle School (Subject: _________)
   - Secondary Education (Subject(s): _________)
   - Sp Ed--Early Childhood Special Education
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: BD/ED
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Learning Disabled
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Mentally Handicapped
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Cross Categorical
   - Sp Ed--Severely Developmentally Disordered
   - Sp Ed--Speech/Language Specialist
   - Sp Ed--Blind/Partially Sighted
   - School Counselor (K-8)
   - School Counselor (7-12)
   - School Counselor (K-12)
   - School Psychological Examiner (K-12)
   - School Psychologist (K-12)
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Physical & OI
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Mentally Handicapped
   - Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Learning Disabled
   - Sp Ed--Severely Developmentally Disordered
   - Sp Ed--Speech/Language Specialist
   - Sp Ed--Blind/Partially Sighted
   - School Counselor (K-8)
   - School Counselor (7-12)
   - School Psychologist (K-12)
   - Other, Specify_________________________________

13. I work in
   - Affton
   - Bayless
   - Brentwood
   - Clayon
   - Ferguson-Florissant
   - Hancock Place
   - Hazelwood
   - Jennings
   - Kirkwood
   - Ladue
   - Lindbergh
   - Maplewood Richmond Heights
   - Mehville
   - Normandy
   - Parkway
   - Pattonville
   - Ritenour
   - Riverview Gardens
   - Rockwood
   - University City
   - Valley Park
   - Webster Groves
   - Wellston
   - Special Education School
   - Technical Education School

===============================================================================

Rate the degree to which you are currently implementing the following skills in your classroom for students with mental retardation. If you do not have the opportunity to implement the following skills, please darken the "NA" for not applicable.

**Quality Instruction in the Area of Literacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: N=Not at all</th>
<th>L=Limited</th>
<th>M=Moderate</th>
<th>O=Often</th>
<th>A=Always</th>
<th>NA=Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Text comprehension instruction strategies are provided in the following manners: (Darken all that apply)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   - Comprehension monitoring
   - Cooperative learning
   - Use of graphic and semantic organizers
   - Question answering
   - Question generation
   - Story structure
   - Summarization
   - Not applicable or None
| Response Definition: N=Not at all   L=Limited   M=Moderate   O=Often   A=Always   NA=Not applicable |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 20. Use knowledge of students to design educational experience | N L M O A NA     |
| 21. Provide for student and adult interactions in planned literacy activities | N L M O A NA     |
| 22. Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting | N L M O A NA     |
| 23. Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills | N L M O A NA     |
| 24. Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment | N L M O A NA     |
| 25. Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation | N L M O A NA     |
| 26. Utilize multiple strategies/methods in literacy instruction | N L M O A NA     |
| 27. Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent (GLE), Show-Me Standards) | N L M O A NA     |
| 28. Have high expectation for students with mental retardation | N L M O A NA     |
| 29. I received adequate training to teach reading effectively | Y N              |
| 30. I received adequate training to teach writing effectively | Y N              |

**Effective supports or resources for your students with mental retardation**

31. What effective supports or resources do you use for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive technology support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resource Center (IRC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/family support in literacy activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development/Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology/Software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rich environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning strategies for reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner district personnel support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/Modification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Additional comments regarding supports you have used.

33. What effective supports or resources do you need for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive technology support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resource Center (IRC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/family support in literacy activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development/Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology/Software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rich environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning strategies for reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner district personnel support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/Modification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. Additional comments regarding supports you need.

[Blank space]

Reading

35. I provide direct reading instruction to students with mental retardation.
   ○ Yes  ○ No, skip next item

36. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?
   ○ less than 80 min/std/wk  ○ 80-149  ○ 150-249
   ○ 250-350  ○ more than 350

37. My students receive direct reading instruction in the general education classroom without support
   ○ Yes  ○ No, skip next item

38. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?
   ○ less than 80 min/std/wk  ○ 80-149  ○ 150-249
   ○ 250-350  ○ more than 350

39. My students receive direct reading instruction in general education classroom with para educator support.
   ○ Yes  ○ No, skip next item

40. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?
   ○ less than 80 min/std/wk  ○ 80-149  ○ 150-249
   ○ 250-350  ○ more than 350

41. My students receive direct reading instruction in a collaborative teaching (CT) or class within a class (CWC) general education classroom.
   ○ Yes  ○ No, skip next item

42. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?
   ○ less than 80 min/std/wk  ○ 80-149  ○ 150-249
   ○ 250-350  ○ more than 350

43. What reading skills do you focus on during instruction? (Darken all that apply)
   ○ Decoding  ○ Fluency  ○ Comprehension

44. I use the following instructional methods/strategies in my reading instruction. (Darken all that apply)
   ○ Sight word instruction  ○ Word analysis
   ○ 4 Block  ○ Balanced literacy
   ○ Phonetic instruction  ○ Multi-media computer instruction
   ○ Essential skills vocabulary instruction  ○ Planned interactions with adults/peers in activities
   ○ Experiential/Explorative learning  ○ Planned opportunities for modeled reading
   ○ Other___________________________

45. I use the following instructional materials and/or curriculum. (Darken all that apply)
   ○ Teacher made  ○ Commercial  ○ Partner district  ○ Other_______

46. Please describe the materials you use in reading instruction.
Writing

47. I provide direct writing instruction to students with mental retardation.
   ○ Yes  ○ No, skip next item

48. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in writing?
   ○ <80 min/std/wk  ○ 80-149  ○ 150-249  ○ 250-350

49. Writing instruction is mainly provided in the following manner: (darken only ONE)
   ○ Stand alone program  ○ Embed in reading instruction
   ○ Other____________  ○ Not applicable or None

50. I use the following instructional materials and/or curriculum. (Darken all that apply)
   ○ Teacher made  ○ Commercial  ○ Partner district  ○ Other______

51. Please describe what methods/strategies you use to help students in writing (i.e., KU Writing Strategies)

52. In what setting is the writing instruction provided? (Darken all that apply)
   ○ Special education setting  ○ General education (gen ed) setting without support
   ○ CT or CWC  ○ Gen ed setting with para educator support
   ○ Other______

How do you measure student progress in the area of literacy?

53. I track my students’ progress in the area of literacy...........................................................................................................................................  ○  ○

54. I utilize the following (student assessment data) of literacy assessment to measure/track my students progress (Darken all that apply).
   ○ IEP goal(s)/Benchmarks  ○ Classroom grades
   ○ Formal testing (i.e., Woodcock Johnson)  ○ Student work samples
   ○ Reading inventories (i.e., IRI, QRI)  ○ Pre-post testing
   ○ Observations  ○ Checklists
   ○ Parent interviews  ○ District standardized test(s)
   ○ MAP or MAP-A  ○ Other____________

Response Definition: SD=Strongly Disagree  D=Disagree  N=Neutral  A=Agree  SA=Strongly Agree  NA=Don’t know/Not applicable

55. I am comfortable analyzing student assessment data. ..........................................................................................................................  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○

56. I change/modify my instruction based on the results of student assessment data..........................................................  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○

57. Although time consuming, I perceive data analysis as valuable component of student achievement.......  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○

58. I need additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy..........................  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○

What kind of gains have your students made?

59. If your students are making progress, what kind of behavioral changes have your students made in the area of literacy? (Darken all that apply)
   Students are engaged in meaningful literacy activities:
   ○ activating prior knowledge  ○ word knowledge  ○ reading for a purpose
   ○ writing for a purpose  ○ reading for pleasure  ○ Other_________
APPENDIX 4-2

Teacher Survey Results
MR Teacher Survey

Creation Date: 6/16/2005
Time Interval: 4/22/2005 to 6/14/2005
Total Respondents: 233

1. My role is (darken all that apply)

- Cross categorical resource room teacher: 33 (14%)
- Self-contained cross categorical classroom: 117 (50%)
- SSD school teacher: 90 (39%)
- Other: 16 (7%)

Total Responses: 232

2. I provide special education services in a collaborative teaching (CT) or class within a class (CWC) model.

- Yes, Please list subject area(s): 36 (16%)
- No: 183 (84%)

Total Responses: 219

3. I primarily work in

- Elementary school: 104 (46%)
- Middle school: 41 (18%)
- High school: 81 (36%)

Total Responses: 226

4. What are the educational placements of the students with mental retardation you serve. (darken all that apply).

- <21% of school day outside regular class: 13 (6%)
- 21-60% of school day outside regular class: 77 (34%)
- >60% of school day outside regular class: 111 (49%)
- Public separate facility (SSD School): 56 (25%)

Total Responses: 227
5. What is the percentage of students on your caseload with mental retardation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 25% of students with MR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 25% to 50% of students with MR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 51% to 75% of students with MR</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 75% of students with MR</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 2.57</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is the percentage of time you work with students with mental retardation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 75%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 3.25</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I have a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree + courses</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree + courses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 3.07</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The number of years I have worked in an educational setting is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Range</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The number of years I have worked in the special education area is

1. less than 3 years 15 6%
2. 3-5 years 34 15%
3. 6-10 years 48 21%
4. 11-15 years 40 17%
5. 16-25 years 54 23%
6. 26-35 years 42 18%
Total Responses: 233

10. The number of years I have worked at Special School District is

1. less than 3 years 27 12%
2. 3-5 years 57 24%
3. 6-10 years 42 18%
4. 11-15 years 39 17%
5. 16-25 years 46 20%
6. 26-35 years 22 9%
Total Responses: 233

11. The number of certification(s) or license(s) I have in education.

1. 1 26 11%
2. 2 57 25%
3. 3 55 24%
4. 4 63 28%
5. 5 17 7%
6. 6 or more 9 4%
Total Responses: 227
12. I have certification(s) or license(s) in (check all that apply)

- 1. Elementary Education--Early Childhood (B-3) 42 18%
- 2. Elementary Education--1-6 119 52%
- 3. Middle School (Subject: ______________) 19 8%
- 4. Secondary Education (Subject(s): ______________) 13 6%
- 5. Sp Ed--Early Childhood Special Education 17 7%
- 6. Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: BD/ED 121 52%
- 7. Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Learning Disabled 133 58%
- 8. Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Mentally Handicapped 129 56%
- 9. Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Cross Categorical 102 44%
- 10. Sp Ed--Mild/Moderate: Physical & OI 13 6%
- 11. Sp Ed--Severely Developmentally Disordered 41 18%
- 12. Sp Ed--Speech/Language Specialist 1 0%
- 13. Sp Ed--Blind/Partially Sighted 1 0%
- 14. Sp Ed--Deaf/Hearing Impaired 2 1%
- 15. School Counselor (K-8) 1 0%
- 16. School Counselor (7-12) 3 1%
- 17. School Counselor (K-12) 1 0%
- 18. School Psychological Examiner (K-12) 2 1%
- 19. School Psychologist (K-12) 1 0%
- 20. Other, Specify_____________________ 40 17%

Total Responses: 231

13. I work in

- 1. Affton 2 1%
- 2. Bayless 1 0%
- 3. Brentwood 1 0%
- 4. Clayton 2 1%
- 5. Ferguson-Florissant 16 7%
- 6. Hancock Place 5 2%
- 7. Hazelwood 16 7%
- 8. Jennings 12 5%
- 9. Kirkwood 3 1%
- 10. Ladue 4 2%
- 11. Lindbergh 7 3%
- 12. Maplewood Richmond Heights 1 0%
- 13. Mehlville 7 3%
- 14. Normandy 10 4%
- 15. Parkway 14 6%
- 16. Pattonville 3 1%
- 17. Ritenour 4 2%
- 18. Riverview Gardens 21 9%
- 19. Rockwood 19 8%
- 20. University City 9 4%
- 21. Valley Park 5 2%
- 22. Webster Groves 2 1%
- 23. Wellston 3 1%
- 24. Special Education School 64 28%
- 25. Technical Education School 0 0%

Total Responses: 231
14. Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness).

1. Not at all 24 11%
2. Limited 28 12%
3. Moderate 29 13%
4. Often 52 23%
5. Always 58 25%
6. Not applicable 37 16%

Total Responses: 228
Mean: 3.48 Standard Deviation: 1.38

15. Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction).

1. Not at all 17 7%
2. Limited 33 14%
3. Moderate 26 11%
4. Often 51 22%
5. Always 71 31%
6. Not applicable 31 14%

Total Responses: 229
Mean: 3.64 Standard Deviation: 1.34

16. Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency).

1. Not at all 18 8%
2. Limited 36 16%
3. Moderate 33 14%
4. Often 59 26%
5. Always 56 24%
6. Not applicable 29 13%

Total Responses: 231
Mean: 3.49 Standard Deviation: 1.31

17. Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary).

1. Not at all 4 2%
2. Limited 15 6%
3. Moderate 32 14%
4. Often 65 28%
5. Always 94 41%
6. Not applicable 21 9%

Total Responses: 231
Mean: 4.10 Standard Deviation: 1.03
18. Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 223
Mean: 3.88 Standard Deviation: 1.15

19. Text comprehension instruction strategies are provided in the following manners: (Darken all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension monitoring</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of graphic and semantic organizers</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question answering</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question generation</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story structure</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarization</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable or None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 224

20. Use knowledge of students to design educational experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 231
Mean: 4.56 Standard Deviation: 0.69

21. Provide for student and adult interactions in planned literacy activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 227
Mean: 4.04 Standard Deviation: 1.03
22. Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting.

1. Not at all 0 0%
2. Limited 11 5%
3. Moderate 38 17%
4. Often 61 27%
5. Always 113 49%
6. Not applicable 7 3%
Total Responses: 230
Mean: 4.24 Standard Deviation: 0.91

23. Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills.

1. Not at all 0 0%
2. Limited 1 0%
3. Moderate 20 9%
4. Often 62 27%
5. Always 146 63%
6. Not applicable 2 1%
Total Responses: 231
Mean: 4.54 Standard Deviation: 0.67

24. Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment.

1. Not at all 7 3%
2. Limited 45 20%
3. Moderate 42 19%
4. Often 72 32%
5. Always 49 22%
6. Not applicable 10 4%
Total Responses: 225
Mean: 3.52 Standard Deviation: 1.15

25. Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation.

1. Not at all 18 8%
2. Limited 39 17%
3. Moderate 38 17%
4. Often 52 23%
5. Always 52 23%
6. Not applicable 31 13%
Total Responses: 230
Mean: 3.41 Standard Deviation: 1.31

- 1. Not at all: 1 (0%)
- 2. Limited: 8 (3%)
- 3. Moderate: 25 (11%)
- 4. Often: 70 (30%)
- 5. Always: 119 (52%)
- 6. Not applicable: 8 (3%)

Total Responses: 231
Mean: 4.34  Standard Deviation: 0.85

27. Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent (GLE), Show-Me Standards)

- 1. Not at all: 1 (0%)
- 2. Limited: 125 (5%)
- 3. Moderate: 37 (16%)
- 4. Often: 51 (22%)
- 5. Always: 121 (52%)
- 6. Not applicable: 9 (4%)

Total Responses: 231
Mean: 4.26  Standard Deviation: 0.95

28. Have high expectation for students with mental retardation.

- 1. Not at all: 0 (0%)
- 2. Limited: 21 (1%)
- 3. Moderate: 63 (3%)
- 4. Often: 35 (15%)
- 5. Always: 185 (81%)
- 6. Not applicable: 1 (0%)

Total Responses: 229
Mean: 4.77  Standard Deviation: 0.53

29. I received adequate training to teach reading effectively.

- Yes: 189 (83%)
- No: 38 (17%)

Total Responses: 227
Mean: 1.17  Standard Deviation: 0.37
30. I received adequate training to teach writing effectively.

1. Yes 173 76%
2. No 54 24%
Total Responses: 227
Mean: 1.24  Standard Deviation: 0.43

31. What effective supports or resources do you use for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

1. Administrative support 95 42% 9. Instructional Resource Center (IRC) 123 54%
2. Staff development/Training 145 64% 10. Partner district personnel support 64 28%
3. Assistive technology support 101 44% 11. Parent/family support in literacy activities 61 27%
4. Instructional technology/Software 110 48% 12. Adaptation/Modification 224 98%
5. Materials support 166 73% 13. Time resources 44 19%
6. Literacy rich environment 149 65% 14. Repetition 212 93%
7. Facilitator support 50 22% 15. Slower pace 212 93%
8. Learning strategies for reading 150 66% 16. Other ____________________ 24 11%
Total Responses: 228

33. What effective supports or resources do you need for students with mental retardation? (Darken all that apply)

1. Administrative support 61 29% 9. Instructional Resource Center (IRC) 47 23%
2. Staff development/Training 98 47% 10. Partner district personnel support 46 22%
3. Assistive technology support 79 38% 11. Parent/family support in literacy activities 68 33%
4. Instructional technology/Software 112 54% 12. Adaptation/Modification 68 33%
5. Materials support 123 59% 13. Time resources 45 22%
6. Literacy rich environment 61 29% 14. Repetition 54 26%
7. Facilitator support 43 21% 15. Slower pace 48 23%
8. Learning strategies for reading 70 34% 16. Other ____________________ 12 6%
Total Responses: 208
35. I provide direct reading instruction to students with mental retardation.

1. Yes 183 81%
2. No, skip next item 44 19%
Total Responses: 227

36. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?

1. less than 80 min/std/wk 24 13%
2. 80-149 28 15%
3. 150-249 39 22%
4. 250-350 49 27%
5. more than 350 41 23%
Total Responses: 181

37. My students receive direct reading instruction in the general education classroom without support

1. Yes 18 8%
2. No, skip next item 205 92%
Total Responses: 223

38. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?

1. less than 80 min/std/wk 2 8%
2. 80-149 3 12%
3. 150-249 8 33%
4. 250-350 6 25%
5. more than 350 5 21%
Total Responses: 24
39. My students receive direct reading instruction in general education classroom with para educator support.

1. Yes 27 12%
2. No, skip next item 196 88%
Total Responses: 223

40. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?

1. less than 80 min/std/wk 8 24%
2. 80-149 6 18%
3. 150-249 9 27%
4. 250-350 6 18%
5. more than 350 4 12%
Total Responses: 33

41. My students receive direct reading instruction in a collaborative teaching (CT) or class within a class (CWC) general education classroom.

1. Yes 24 11%
2. No, skip next item 199 89%
Total Responses: 223

42. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in reading?

1. less than 80 min/std/wk 5 19%
2. 80-149 6 22%
3. 150-249 9 33%
4. 250-350 4 15%
5. more than 350 3 11%
Total Responses: 27
43. What reading skills do you focus on during instruction? (Darken all that apply)

1. Decoding 170 78%
2. Fluency 107 49%
3. Comprehension 207 95%
Total Responses: 217

44. I use the following instructional methods/strategies in my reading instruction. (Darken all that apply)

1. Sight word instruction 190 88%
2. Word analysis 87 40%
3. 4 Block 28 13%
4. Balanced literacy 80 37%
5. Phonetic instruction 132 61%
6. Multi-media computer instruction 55 25%
7. Essential skills vocabulary instruction 89 41%
8. Planned interactions with adults/peers in activi... 109 50%
9. Experiential/Explorative learning 53 25%
10. Planned opportunities for modeled reading 137 63%
11. Other ___________________________ 17 8%
Total Responses: 216

45. I use the following instructional materials and/or curriculum. (Darken all that apply)

1. Teacher made 205 92%
2. Commercial 177 80%
3. Partner district 86 39%
4. Other _________ 13 6%
Total Responses: 222

47. I provide direct writing instruction to students with mental retardation.

1. Yes 187 82%
2. No, skip next item 40 18%
Total Responses: 227
48. If yes, average # of minutes per student per week in writing?

- <80 min/std/wk: 42, 23%
- 80-149: 46, 25%
- 150-249: 60, 33%
- 250-350: 33, 18%

Total Responses: 181

49. Writing instruction is mainly provided in the following manner: (darken only ONE)

- Stand alone program: 48, 22%
- Embedment in reading instruction: 118, 55%
- Other: 23, 11%
- Not applicable or None: 27, 12%

Total Responses: 216

50. I use the following instructional materials and/or curriculum. (Darken all that apply)

- Teacher made: 185, 89%
- Commercial: 143, 68%
- Partner district: 68, 33%
- Other: 8, 4%

Total Responses: 209

52. In what setting is the writing instruction provided? (Darken all that apply)

- Special education setting: 212, 99%
- General education (gen ed) setting without support: 11, 5%
- CT or CWC: 14, 7%
- Gen ed setting with para educator support: 23, 11%
- Other: 5, 2%

Total Responses: 214
53. I track my students' progress in the area of literacy.

1. Yes 197 92%
2. No 16 8%
Total Responses: 213
Mean: 1.08 Standard Deviation: 0.26

54. I utilize the following (student assessment data) of literacy assessment to measure/track my students progress (Darken all that apply).

1. IEP goal(s)/Benchmarks 207 92%
2. Classroom grades 107 47%
3. Formal testing (i.e., Woodcock Johnson) 28 12%
4. Student work samples 184 81%
5. Reading inventories (i.e., IRI, QRI) 79 35%
6. Pre-post testing 90 40%
7. Observations 182 81%
8. Checklists 83 37%
9. Parent interviews 13 6%
10. District standardized test(s) 62 27%
11. MAP or MAP-A 75 33%
12. Other 17 8%
Total Responses: 226

55. I am comfortable analyzing student assessment data.

1. Strongly Disagree 0 0%
2. Disagree 18 8%
3. Neutral 46 20%
4. Agree 114 50%
5. Strongly Agree 45 20%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 4 2%
Total Responses: 227
Mean: 3.83 Standard Deviation: 0.84

56. I change/modify my instruction based on the results of student assessment data.

1. Strongly Disagree 0 0%
2. Disagree 3 1%
3. Neutral 17 7%
4. Agree 122 54%
5. Strongly Agree 78 34%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 8 4%
Total Responses: 228
Mean: 4.25 Standard Deviation: 0.65
57. Although time consuming, I perceive data analysis as valuable component of student achievement.

1. Strongly Disagree 0 0%
2. Disagree 6 3%
3. Neutral 32 14%
4. Agree 126 56%
5. Strongly Agree 55 24%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 7 3%
Total Responses: 226
Mean: 4.05 Standard Deviation: 0.71

58. I need additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy.

1. Strongly Disagree 10 4%
2. Disagree 31 14%
3. Neutral 74 33%
4. Agree 86 38%
5. Strongly Agree 23 10%
6. Don't know/Not applicable 3 1%
Total Responses: 227
Mean: 3.36 Standard Deviation: 0.99
59. If your students are making progress, what kind of behavioral changes have your students made in the area of literacy? (Darken all that apply)

1. activating prior knowledge
2. word knowledge
3. reading for a purpose
4. writing for a purpose
5. reading for pleasure
6. Other

Total Responses: 220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. activating prior knowledge</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. word knowledge</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. reading for a purpose</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. writing for a purpose</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. reading for pleasure</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4-3

Teacher Survey Analysis Across Grade Levels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Only</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Item #</strong></td>
<td>E=1</td>
<td>M=3</td>
<td>H=9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. not at all; 5= always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=4: Progressing 3-4; Challenge &lt;3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teach students to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken syllables and words (phonemic awareness).</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>* E&gt;M&gt;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teach students to stress the acquisition of letter-sound correspondences and their use in reading and spelling (phonics instruction).</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>* E&gt;M&gt;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach students to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (fluency).</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>* E&gt;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach students oral and written vocabulary to increase word knowledge (vocabulary).</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provide text comprehension instruction to promote intentional thinking and construction of meaning (text comprehension).</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Use knowledge of students to design educational experience.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Provide for student and adult interactions in planned literacy activities.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Provide literacy rich environment in the school setting.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Support students through generalization and maintenance of acquired skills.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Integrate instructional and/or assistive technology into the literacy learning environment.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Implement specific assistive technology to meet the needs of students with mental retardation.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Utilize multiple strategies/methods in literacy instruction.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Address district and state curriculum standards when planning and delivering instruction (i.e., grade level equivalent (GLE), Show-Me Standards).</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Have high expectation for students with mental retardation.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>* E&gt;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I received adequate training to teach reading effectively. Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I received adequate training to teach writing effectively. Yes</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree** |     |     |     |      |
| **Strength:**                     |     |     |     |      |
| >=4: Progressing 3-4; Challenge <3 |     |     |     |      |
| 53. I track my students' progress in the area of literacy. Yes | 96% | 100% | 83% | *    |
| 55. I am comfortable analyzing student assessment data. | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.8 |      |
| 56. I change/modify my instruction based on the results of student assessment data. | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.2 |      |
| 57. Although time consuming, I perceive data analysis as valuable component of student achievement. | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 |      |
| 58. I need additional staff development in the area of assessing student progress in literacy. | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.3 |      |
APPENDIX 5-1

Parent Climate Survey
The purpose of this survey is to assist Special School District in planning and considering school improvement processes over the next few years. Please take 5 to 10 minutes to complete this 3-page survey. Your input is very important to the planning of the district. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Dr. Chialin Hsieh at 314.989.8523 or email to chsieh@ssd.k12.mo.us. Please return the survey by May 31, 2005 in the enclosed self-addressed return envelope to Dr. Chialin Hsieh, Program Evaluation, Special School District, 12110 Clayton Road, Town & Country, MO 63131.

Instructions: Please darken the circle that best describes what you think or how you feel about the 2004-2005 school year of Special School District. If the statement is not applicable to you, please darken the "NA" circle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: SD=Strongly Disagree   D=Disagree   N= Moderate   A=Agree   SA=Strongly Agree   NA=Not applicable/Do not know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am informed about my child's progress by his/her special education teacher..............................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know what my child's special education teacher expects of my child.................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The special education teachers show respect for my child....................................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students show respect for other students...............................................................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The special education teacher-special education school meets the social needs of my child...............................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The special education teacher-special education school meets the academic needs of my child...........................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The special education teacher expects quality work of my child.........................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I know how well my child is progressing in special education classes and in school..................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am welcome to discuss my child's special educational needs with the special education staff..............................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I respect the school's special education teachers...............................................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The special education teacher helps me to help my child learn at home...................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I support my child's learning at home......................................................................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There is a lot of teamwork between special education and general education staff................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Overall, the special education teacher/special education school meets the needs of my child.................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Special School District succeeds at preparing children for future work..................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Special School District has a good public image...............................................................................................................................</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Information

17. Child's grade:
   - O Kindergarten or younger
   - O 2nd grade
   - O 4th grade
   - O 6th grade
   - O 8th grade
   - O 10th grade
   - O 12th grade
   - O Early Childhood Special Education
   - O 1st grade
   - O 3rd grade
   - O 5th grade
   - O 7th grade
   - O 9th grade
   - O 11th grade
   - O Multiple-grade
18. My child has special education services
   - less than 20% of a school day
   - more than 60% of a school day
   - not applicable/no special education services
   - between 20% to 60% of a school day
   - early childhood special education (ECSE)

19. My child has been receiving services from Special School District for
   - less than 1 year
   - 1 to 2 years
   - 3 to 4 years
   - 5 to 6 years
   - 7 to 8 years
   - more than 8 years

20. My child's ethnic background
    - African-American
    - American Indian
    - Asian
    - Caucasian
    - Hispanic/Latino
    - Other

21. My child's primary educational disability is
    - Autism
    - Emotional Disturbance
    - Mental Retardation
    - Orthopedic Impairment
    - Learning Disabilities
    - Traumatic Brain Injury
    - Young Child with a Developmental Delay
    - Deaf/Blindness
    - Hearing Impairment/Deafness
    - Multiple Disabilities
    - Other Health Impairments
    - Speech/Language Impairment
    - Visual Impairment/Blind
    - None

22. My child's home school district is
    (If your child attends special education school, please darken the circle "Special education school").
    - Affton
    - Clayton
    - Hazelwood
    - Ladue
    - Mehlville
    - Pattonville
    - Rockwood
    - Webster Groves
    - Bayless
    - Ferguson-Florissant
    - Jennings
    - Lindbergh
    - Normandy
    - Ritenour
    - University City
    - Wellston
    - Brentwood
    - Hancock Place
    - Kirkwood
    - Maplewood Richmond Heights
    - Parkway
    - Riverview Gardens
    - Valley Park
    - Special Education School

23. What do you think Special School District should continue to do?

24. What do you think Special School District should stop doing?

25. What do you think Special School District should start doing?

26. What do you think Special School District should study?
APPENDIX 5-2

Parent Climate Survey Results
1. I am informed about my child's progress by his/her special education teacher.

- **Strongly Disagree**: 4 (2%)
- **Disagree**: 9 (5%)
- **Moderate**: 20 (11%)
- **Agree**: 52 (30%)
- **Strongly Agree**: 90 (51%)
- **Not applicable/Do not know**: 1 (1%)

   Total Responses: 176

   Mean: 4.23    Standard Deviation: 1.00

2. I know what my child's special education teacher expects of my child.

- **Strongly Disagree**: 4 (2%)
- **Disagree**: 8 (5%)
- **Neutral**: 18 (10%)
- **Agree**: 61 (35%)
- **Strongly Agree**: 83 (47%)
- **Not applicable/Do not know**: 1 (1%)

   Total Responses: 175

   Mean: 4.21    Standard Deviation: 0.97

3. The special education teachers show respect for my child.

- **Strongly Disagree**: 5 (3%)
- **Disagree**: 1 (1%)
- **Moderate**: 11 (6%)
- **Agree**: 49 (28%)
- **Strongly Agree**: 107 (61%)
- **Not applicable/Do not know**: 2 (1%)

   Total Responses: 175

   Mean: 4.46    Standard Deviation: 0.87

4. Students show respect for other students.

- **Strongly Disagree**: 5 (3%)
- **Disagree**: 6 (3%)
- **Neutral**: 24 (14%)
- **Agree**: 74 (43%)
- **Strongly Agree**: 57 (33%)
- **Not applicable/Do not know**: 8 (5%)

   Total Responses: 174

   Mean: 4.04    Standard Deviation: 0.95
5. The special education teacher/special education school meets the social needs of my child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/Not applicable</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 175
Mean: 3.93    Standard Deviation: 1.13

6. The special education teacher/special education school meets the academic needs of my child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/Not applicable</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 175
Mean: 4.01    Standard Deviation: 1.03

7. The special education teacher expects quality work of my child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 175
Mean: 4.09    Standard Deviation: 1.04

8. I know how well my child is progressing in special education classes and in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 173
Mean: 4.04    Standard Deviation: 1.08
9. I am welcome to discuss my child's special educational needs with the special education staff.

   - Strongly Disagree: 2 (1%)
   - Disagree: 6 (3%)
   - Neutral: 7 (4%)
   - Agree: 53 (30%)
   - Strongly Agree: 105 (60%)
   - Not applicable/Do not know: 1 (1%)

   Total Responses: 174
   Mean: 4.46    Standard Deviation: 0.82

10. I respect the school's special education teachers.

   - Strongly Disagree: 5 (3%)
   - Disagree: 5 (3%)
   - Neutral: 11 (6%)
   - Agree: 51 (29%)
   - Strongly Agree: 101 (58%)
   - Not applicable/Do not know: 1 (1%)

   Total Responses: 174
   Mean: 4.38    Standard Deviation: 0.94

11. The special education teacher helps me to help my child learn at home.

   - Strongly Disagree: 7 (4%)
   - Disagree: 16 (9%)
   - Moderate: 30 (17%)
   - Agree: 56 (32%)
   - Strongly Agree: 58 (33%)
   - Not applicable/Do not know: 7 (4%)

   Total Responses: 174
   Mean: 3.85    Standard Deviation: 1.13

12. I support my child's learning at home.

   - Strongly Disagree: 2 (1%)
   - Disagree: 3 (2%)
   - Neutral: 7 (4%)
   - Agree: 62 (36%)
   - Strongly Agree: 96 (56%)
   - Not applicable/Do not know: 2 (1%)

   Total Responses: 172
   Mean: 4.45    Standard Deviation: 0.76
13. There is a lot of teamwork between special education and general education staff.

1. Strongly Disagree
   10 6%
2. Disagree
   16 9%
3. Neutral
   28 16%
4. Agree
   42 24%
5. Strongly Agree
   50 29%
6. Not applicable/Do not know
   27 16%

Total Responses: 173
Mean: 3.73 Standard Deviation: 1.23

14. Overall, the special education teacher/special education school meets the needs of my child.

1. Strongly Disagree
   6 3%
2. Disagree
   7 4%
3. Neutral
   19 11%
4. Agree
   64 37%
5. Strongly Agree
   75 43%
6. Don't know/Not applicable
   2 1%

Total Responses: 173
Mean: 4.14 Standard Deviation: 1.01

15. Special School District succeeds at preparing children for future work.

1. Strongly Disagree
   5 3%
2. Disagree
   11 6%
3. Moderate
   23 13%
4. Agree
   56 33%
5. Strongly Agree
   52 30%
6. Not applicable/Do not know
   24 14%

Total Responses: 171
Mean: 3.95 Standard Deviation: 1.06

16. Special School District has a good public image.

1. Strongly Disagree
   4 2%
2. Disagree
   18 10%
3. Moderate
   38 22%
4. Agree
   61 35%
5. Strongly Agree
   48 28%
6. Not applicable/Do not know
   4 2%

Total Responses: 173
Mean: 3.78 Standard Deviation: 1.05
### 17. Child's grade:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten or younger</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd grade</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th grade</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th grade</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-grade</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses:** 170

### 18. My child has special education services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 20% of a school day</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 20% to 60% of a school day</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 60% of a school day</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early childhood special education (ECSE)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable/no special education services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses:** 169

### 19. My child has been receiving services from Special School District for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6 years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 8 years</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 8 years</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses:** 175
20. My child's ethnic background

1. African-American 34 20%
2. American Indian 1 1%
3. Asian 4 2%
4. Caucasian 123 74%
5. Hispanic/Latino 3 2%
6. Other 2 1%
Total Responses: 167

21. My child's primary educational disability is

1. Autism 0 0% 8. Other Health Impairments 0 0%
2. Deaf/Blindness 0 0% 9. Learning Disabilities 0 0%
3. Emotional Disturbance 0 0% 10. Speech/Language Impairment 0 0%
4. Hearing Impairment/Deafness 0 0% 11. Traumatic Brain Injury 0 0%
5. Mental Retardation 176 100% 12. Visual Impairment/Blind 0 0%
6. Multiple Disabilities 0 0% 13. Young Child with a Developmental Delay 0 0%
7. Orthopedic Impairment 0 0% 14. None 0 0%
Total Responses: 176
22. My child's home school district is
(If your child attends special education school, please darken the circle "Special education school").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson-Florissant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock Place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood Richmond Heights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehlville</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritenour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Gardens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwood</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellston</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 175