



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Program Evaluation Question

1. Are educational surrogates, teachers and SSD administrators aware of the educational surrogate process?

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:
Educational Surrogate Program

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation:
Mary Lee Burlemann

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

Goal/ Objective of Program/ Services:
To identify those students who are in need of an educational surrogate so that they have an advocate for their rights to special education programs and services.

Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:
Program goals are related to MSIP standards. Identification of students in need of an educational surrogate would assist in ensuring that this group of students are afforded the full range of educational programs in the district (MSIP Standards 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 8.1).

Demographic Description of Program:
Location: Central Office
Number of staff: Administrator plus support personnel
Participants: Those identified
Length of program/ service: Annual

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

Community members: Mary Klevorn (former educational surrogate), Kenneth Eigenberg (former educational surrogate)
SSD staff: Dee Byrnes, Anne Wynn
Residential facility: Wendy Ellis-Pikula (Director of Education, Marygrove)



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered

Educational Surrogate/ staff/ SSD administrator survey
Review of Missouri requirements

IV. Data Collection Methodology :

Staff/ administrator survey
Educational surrogate survey
Review of Missouri requirements

V. Results

Strengths of program/service:

There is a process through which students are identified as needing an educational surrogate. Educational surrogates are requested through and appointed by DESE. Educational surrogates are the educational decision makers for students who are wards of the state and they attend eligibility conferences, IEPs and other conferences on behalf of those students. An invested educational surrogate can bring a whole new perspective to a conference and provide new ideas for working with that student. Educational surrogates are needed advocates for their students. Currently there are approximately 80 SSD students with assigned educational surrogates and about 65 students who are waiting for a surrogate to be appointed.

Results of a survey sent to SSD administrators, educational surrogates and IEP chairs indicated that both surrogates and administrators are familiar with the program.

*100% of the 11 administrators and 91% of the 11 educational surrogates who returned surveys know whom to contact at the SSD or state level if they have questions about the program.

*45% of the 11 educational surrogates and 55% of the 11 administrators indicated that they strongly agreed that they have adequate information about the program.

Concerns regarding program/service:

A major concern has always been the length of time it takes from the time of request for DESE to appoint an educational surrogate. Often, students have already exited a facility and are living somewhere in or out of the county by the time the surrogate is appointed. Another concern is the infrequency of training offered. SSD recruits educational surrogates through their annual publications and people call and want to participate in



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

the Educational Surrogate Program, but it can take up to one year for DESE to offer the training locally.

Results of the survey indicated:

- *43% of the 30 IEP chairs are familiar with the educational surrogate program but only 30% know whom to contact if they have questions.
- *40% of the 30 IEP chairs additionally indicated that they feel that they do not have adequate information about the program.
- *50% of the 30 IEP chairs are **unaware** of the process for appointment or termination while 36% of the 11 surrogates and 11 administrators indicated **awareness** of those processes.

The survey results from administrators and surrogates may not be truly representative due to the return rate of 48% out of 23 sent and 37% out of 29 sent respectively by administrators and surrogates.

Recommendations regarding program/service:

- *IEP chairs need to be in-serviced regarding the educational surrogate process. It is apparent that there is a need for ongoing training regarding the surrogate process for IEP chairs who work in those Component Districts that house residential facilities.
- * An IEP audit should be conducted to determine whether educational surrogates are being invited to IEPs and whether or not they are attending IEPs. These statistics will help to target areas of the program within SSD that need improvement.
- *Due to the length of time between DESE trainings, consider discussion with DESE about SSD's offering the educational surrogate training.

Time spent on Program Evaluation:

Approximately 23 hours

VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as A Result of Program Evaluation

- *Develop a letter to be distributed to IEP chairs who work in those Component Districts that house residential facilities describing the responsibilities of the teacher and educational surrogate in regard to those students who have educational surrogates. Outline the process for appointment and termination. Send this letter to the IEP chair when an educational surrogate is appointed.
- *Conduct an IEP audit to determine whether educational surrogates have been invited to IEPs and whether or not they attend the IEP.

----- Date:-----
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation