Program Evaluation Questions:
1. Of the students diagnosed as speech impaired, what percentage are diagnosed in the area of fluency and what trends exist for this area of diagnosis for the last five years?

2. Of the students diagnosed as speech impaired, what percentage are diagnosed in the area of voice and what trends exist for this area of diagnosis for the last five years?

3. Of the students diagnosed as speech impaired, what percentage are diagnosed in the area of sound system disorder and what trends exist for this area of diagnosis in the last five years?

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services: Speech Program

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation: Mitzi Brammer, Area Coordinator and Chair; Linda Evans, Area Coordinator, South Region; Mary Lee Shasserre, Area Coordinator, West Region; Lizabeth Moore, Area Coordinator, North Region; Barb O'Leary, Area Coordinator, Early Childhood; Jacalyn Brotske, SLP, Central Region; Julie Hoffmann, Assoc. Professor, Communication Disorders Dept. SLU

Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration): January 2005 through June, 2005

Goal/Objective of Program/Services: To improve student performance levels.

Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards: The above goal of the speech program supports MSIP (Show-Me) Standards in Communication Arts including:
Knowledge Standards-
1. Speaking and writing standard English (including grammar, usage, punctuation, spelling, capitalization)
6. Participating in formal and informal presentation and discussion of issues and ideas.

Performance Standards-
Goal 2. Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.
CSIP Goals/Objectives supported by the speech program-
1.1 Reduce more restrictive speech and language placements by 5% annually by FY06.
1.2 Meet or exceed the number of students who no longer require speech and language therapy by a 3% increase.

Demographic Description of Program:
Location(s): County-wide (23 partner districts)

Number of staff: 333.4 Itinerant/Resource Level SLPs (school-age level programs)

Participants: All St. Louis County resident students ages 3-21 are eligible for speech screenings and evaluations. IDEA-qualified students with speech impairments are eligible for speech related services as designated in an IEP.

Length of program/service:
Speech Evaluations-
.75 – 1.5 hours per student during the regular school year calendar
Speech Therapy-
Time allocation is determined in IEPs and services are implemented during the regular school calendar and ESY programs.

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation (check stakeholders utilized):

SSD staff
University staff

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered (check type utilized)

Longitudinal performance data
Speech-Language Statistical Data

IV. Data Collection Methodology (examples)

Document review
V. Results

Strengths of program/service:

- Historical data collection via annual statistics continues to be collected for purposes of program analysis, staff realignment/assignment, professional development, and professional services board accreditation through the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA).

- Stability is being maintained in all diagnosed areas of speech impairment. Of the students diagnosed as speech impaired, between 8 and 9% (N=492) are diagnosed in the area of fluency. Over the past five years, this percentage has remained stable. Only in the past year did the percentage rise from 8 to 9%. Of the students diagnosed as speech impaired, between 1 and 2% (N=109) are diagnosed in the area of voice. Over the past five years, this percentage has also maintained stable. Only in the past year did the percentage rise from 1 to 2%. These percentages would indicate that the aforementioned populations are still considered low incidence populations. Of the students diagnosed as speech impaired, an average of 90% (N=4,918) are diagnosed in the area of sound system disorder (articulation). Over the past five years, this percentage has dropped only slightly (1% per year).

Concerns regarding program/service:
The data used to evaluate the speech program was not able to shed light on how long students are on caseload when diagnosed with a speech-impairment. This is an implication for further study/evaluation. Also, for this program evaluation, most of the available data was not disaggregated between speech and language impairments.

Recommendations regarding program/service:

- Statistical data collected for the speech program will be disaggregated between speech and language.

- Explore process for disaggregating speech/language data utilizing Encore at the triennial evaluation with all IEP chairpersons.
VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as A Result of Program Evaluation

Person responsible to champion action plan: Mitzi Brammer, Chair

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education:
Progress reports by 12/15/05 and 6/1/06

______________________________________  Date:_________
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation