**Coordinator Name**
Lynne Midyett

**Planning Team**
Lynne Midyett
Randy Barnes

**Description of the Program (2012-2013)**
SSD provides Special Education supports and services to twenty two partner districts in St. Louis County in order to meet state performance and process standards. Since its inception in 1955, SSD staff providing services to the partner districts have grown to 1273 teachers, 1362 paraprofessionals, 302 Related Services staff, 327 Speech and Language Pathologists, and 29 ABA Associates. They provide educational supports and related services to 19,854 special education students.

**Description of How the Program’s Services are Developed and Delivered**
The program’s services are guided by the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) process which was designed to comply with federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Missouri state plan for special education and ongoing revisions. Management of special education processes is provided by Directors who supervise 78 area coordinators in 238 buildings in the partner districts. Area coordinators supervise individual teachers who provide services to students in general education and special education settings.

**Key Program Stakeholder Groups**
- [x] Students
- [ ] Parents
- [x] Staff
- [x] Administrators
- [ ] Board of Education
- [ ] Taxpayers
- [ ] Other (30T)

**Student and/ or Stakeholder Needs Addressed by the Program**
This program provides support and education for students with special needs throughout St. Louis County.

**Overall Goals of the Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Meet the State Performance targets for least restrictive educational environment (LRE).</th>
<th>Expected Measurable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The number of partner districts meeting the state target of more than 59.5 percent of the students with disabilities, ages 6 through 21, inside the regular class 80% or more of the day will meet/sustain or exceed the three year mean trend of 20 districts.</td>
<td>1.2 The number of partner districts meeting the state target of less than 10.2 percent of students with disabilities, ages 6 through 21 inside regular class less than 40 percent of the day will meet/sustain or exceed the three year mean trend of 15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Meet state performance targets for graduation and drop-out rates for students with disabilities.</th>
<th>2.1 The number of partner districts meeting the state target for graduation rate of students with disabilities will meet or exceed the three year mean trend of 14.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The number of partner districts meeting the state target for the drop-out rate of students with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disabilities will meet or exceed the three year mean trend of 17.

| Goal 3: Provide equitable services to help IEP students close the achievement gap. | 3.1 The difference between scores for IEP students and for general education students will be generally constant across districts for English Language Arts.  
3.2 The difference between scores for IEP students and for general education students will be generally constant across districts for Mathematics.  
3.3 The gap between IEP student scores and general education student scores will narrow over a three year period for English Language Arts.  
3.4 The gap between IEP student scores and general education student scores will narrow over a three year period for Mathematics. |
|---|---|
| Additional data for partner districts | 1. Enrollment by district.  
2. Minority percentage by district.  
3. Free/Reduced lunch by district. |

**Evaluation Questions**
- What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving the goals?
- What do students and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- What do staff consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
- How does the program’s actual implementation compare with the program’s design?
- How should priorities be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?
- How should goals be changed? Any added or removed?

**Data Collection Methods**
- [ ] Surveys and questionnaires
- [ ] Interviews
- [ ] Document reviews
- [ ] Observations
- [ ] Focus groups
- [ ] Case studies
- [x] Assessments
- [ ] Other (Specify)
**Evaluation Results**

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

**Goal 1:** Meet the State Performance targets for least restrictive educational environment (LRE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>1.1 The number of partner districts meeting the state target of more than 59.5 percent of the students with disabilities, ages 6 through 21, inside the regular class 80% or more of the day will meet/sustain or exceed the three year mean trend of 20.67 districts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> Not Met.</td>
<td>The number of partner districts meeting the state target of more than 59.5 percent of the students with disabilities, ages 6 through 21, inside the regular class 80% or more of the day was 20 which was less than the three year average of 20.67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Districts meeting 80% LRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 2010-2012</td>
<td>20.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 2:</th>
<th>1.2 The number of partner districts meeting the state target of less than 10.2 percent of students with disabilities, ages 6 through 21 inside regular class less than 40 percent of the day will meet/sustain or exceed the three year mean trend of 15.3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> Not Met.</td>
<td>14 Districts met the state target of less than 10.2% of students in regular class less than 40 percent of the day while the three year average was 15.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Districts meeting 40% LRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 2010-2012</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Meet state performance targets for graduation and drop-out rates for students with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>2.1 The number of partner districts meeting the state target for graduation rate of students with disabilities will meet or exceed the three year mean trend of 14.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results:</td>
<td>Met. The number of partner districts meeting the state target for graduation rate of students with disabilities was 18 with a three year mean of 14.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts meeting Graduation Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurable Objective 2: 2.2 The number of partner districts meeting the state target for the drop-out rate of students with disabilities will meet or exceed the three year mean trend of 17.6.

| Results: | Not Met. The number of partner districts meeting the state target for the drop-out rate of students with disabilities was 17 with a three year mean of 17.6. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts meeting Drop-out Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 3: Provide equitable services to help IEP students close the achievement gap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>3.1 The difference between scores for IEP students and for general education students will be generally constant across districts for English Language Arts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results:</td>
<td>Met. The comparison of Map Performance Index (MPI)* scores for non-IEP and IEP scores shows a consistent disparity across districts for English Language Arts. While there are many factors affecting student performance across districts, SSD services affect the disparity between non-IEP and IEP students, bringing IEP students closer to their non-IEP peers within any given district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The difference between scores for IEP students and for non-IEP students was generally constant across districts for English Language Arts. 16 out of 22 (72.7%) districts were within 10 MPI points of the median, 90.

One interpretation of the consistency of the disparity between IEP and non-IEP students is that it is evidence of consistency of instruction and delivery of services across districts. If SSD provided services to some districts, but not to others we would expect to find uneven disparity between districts. Since that is not the case, one explanation is that this consistency in disparity is due to consistent services.
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for IEP students in all districts. To test this interpretation we can examine a random sampling of districts in Missouri who do not have SSD services. The following districts were selected as having a certain minimum size and by first letter of the district name. A= Adrian, B= Belton, C= Camdenton etc.

![Disparity in Comparison Districts](image)

While there is some consistency in the disparity, the trend line is not as flat as the chart of districts served by SSD. In order to examine the disparity more closely the disparities were graphed in pairs in which the districts with the lowest disparity were paired together up to the highest.

![Comparison of disparity between IEP and Non-IEP MPI scores for English Language Arts 2013](image)

Only 8 out of 22 non SSD districts were within 10 points of the median, 90 (36%), compared to 16 out of 22 (72.7%) for districts served by SSD. A more horizontal trend line indicates less disparity across districts.
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For clarity, the highest and lowest outliers were excluded for a line chart. A line that is more horizontal indicates less disparity across districts. A more vertical line represents more disparity.

These comparative data lend credence to the interpretation that SSD is providing services consistently across partner districts and these services are effective in smoothing the disparity between non-IEP and IEP students.

Measurable Objective 2: 3.2 The difference between scores for IEP students and for general education students will be generally constant across districts for Mathematics.

Results: Met. The comparison of Map Performance Index (MPI) scores for non-IEP and IEP scores shows a consistent disparity across districts for Mathematics.
The difference between scores for IEP students and for general education students was generally constant across districts for Mathematics. 15 out of 22 districts were within 10 MPI points of the median, 81.

### Measurable Objective 3:

3.3 The gap between IEP student scores and general education student scores will narrow over a three year period for English Language Arts.

Results: Not Met. The overall gap between IEP student scores and general education student scores grew over a three year period.

### English Language Arts Disparity 2011-2013
Measurable Objective 4: 3.4 The gap between IEP student scores and general education student scores will narrow over a three year period for Mathematics.

Results: Not Met. The gap between IEP student scores and general education student scores grew over a three year period.

Additional data for partner districts provided for context

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

**Strengths**
- *The number of districts meeting DESE targets for graduation exceeded the three year mean.*
- *The disparity between IEP and non-IEP students is more consistent in districts served by SSD compared to a random sampling of districts throughout Missouri.*

**Opportunities/Weaknesses**
- *Partner districts did not meet the three year average for targets in the areas of educational environment (LRE) and dropout rates.*
- *The disparity between IEP and non-IEP partner district students rose over a three year period in both Mathematics and English Language Arts.*
How well aligned are the program’s priorities and processes with the goals of the program?

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

Deployment Level of Program Services: Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.

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

Should goals be changed, added or removed? □ Yes □ No

Evaluation Implications

General Recommendation Resulting from the Evaluation
Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:

☒ Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
☐ Expand the program, replicating effective components.
☐ Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
☐ Redesign the program.
☐ Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
☐ Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
☐ Discontinue the program.
☐ Other (33T)

Action Plans

• Develop a process for deployment of inclusive practices to increase the proportion of minutes a student receives instruction, special education or general education, in a general education setting.
• Identify exemplar programs in partner districts that promote persistence to graduation to study process and results for replication.
• Continue review process of action plans related to systematic interventions in the areas of mathematics and communication arts.
• Deploy Standard-Based IEP Pilot in 22 partner districts and SSD schools. Conduct cycles of learning to guide full deployment.

Status of Previous Action Plans

• Continue the formal review process of action plans for partner districts meeting LRE and graduation targets.

Directors meet regularly with partner districts to review LRE data and graduation data. Action plans have been developed as part of the Region Improvement Planning process and Area Improvement Planning process to address both LRE and graduation.

Inclusion Stakeholder Team established to guide deployment of inclusive practices.
• Continue the formal review process of action plans related to systematic interventions in the areas of mathematics and communication arts.

  Process established to monitor the fidelity of special education interventions in the areas of mathematics and communication arts.

  Process established to monitor the effectiveness of special education interventions in the areas of mathematics and communication arts.

  Project team established to develop an approach for the deployment of standard-based IEPs.

• Explore with DESE ways of extending the transition planning process to ages younger than 16 and searching for best practices in other states for supporting this extension.

  Voice of customer information gathered across 22 high schools in St. Louis County concerning transition planning.

  Analysis of the compliance implications of extending the transition planning process prior to age 16 is in process.

  Professional learning conducted to increase teacher capabilities for effective transition planning elementary thought high school.

**Cost and Funding Source**  The costs are included in the budget.

* Operational Definitions

**MPI** refers to the Missouri Performance Index. This index is weighted by the percent of students scoring at below basic, basic, proficient and advanced within any given group.

**Central Band** as used in this report refers to a range of scores around the median and is used to demonstrate the lack of variance in disparity between districts.