



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

LARAMIE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #2

December 1 – 4, 2008

**Special Programs Unit
320 West Main Street
Riverton, WY 82501
www.k12.wy.us**

**Wyoming Department of Education
Dr. Jim McBride, Superintendent of Public Instruction**

Wyoming Department of Education Continuous Improvement – Focused Monitoring Report

Laramie County School District #2
School Year: 2008 – 2009
Date of On-Site Review: December 1 – 4, 2008

Introduction

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004), Part B, Section 300.600(a) of the Federal Regulations states: *The state must monitor the implementation of this part, enforce this part in accordance with §300.604 (a)(1) and (a)(3), (b)(2)(i) and (b)(2)(v), and (c)(2), and annually report on performance under this part. (b) The primary focus of the State's monitoring activities must be on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.*

Process

A. Performance Indicator Selection

Consistent with the requirements established in Federal Regulations §§300.600 through 300.604, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) focuses on those elements of information and data that most directly relate to or influence student performance, educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

The Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Group¹ worked with the WDE Special Programs Unit to set the priority indicators and weighted scoring system to be used in determining which districts would be selected for on-site monitoring. IDEA 2004 places a strong emphasis on positive educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities ages three through 21. This factor greatly influenced the selection of two key indicators of student performance from the State's Performance Plan as priorities for the focused monitoring process. The ultimate goal of focused monitoring is to promote systems change which will positively influence educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

Districts were selected for on-site monitoring through the application of a weighted formula applied to all 48 districts using two variables. These variables are taken from Indicator 3C of the State Performance Plan (SPP), which can be viewed in its entirety at www.k12.wy.us. With Stakeholder Group input, the focused indicator for the 2008 – 2009 school year was narrowed to include PAWS proficiency rates for secondary school students only in both mathematics and reading.

¹ The Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Group is comprised of principals, special education directors, teachers, parents, advocates and superintendents from across the state.

B. Individual District Selection

Districts were divided into four population groups based on overall enrollment numbers:

- Large Districts – more than 1,950 students
- Medium Districts – 860 to 1,949 students
- Small Districts – 500 to 859 students
- Extra Small Districts – 499 or fewer students

Laramie County School District #2 (LCSD #2) is considered a medium school district and reported a special education population of 150 students on its most recent WDE-425 report. Thus, the district's 2007 – 2008 data was ranked against data from all other medium districts for the same time period. The two lowest performers in each population group were selected for an on-site monitoring visit using the comparison to state rates found below. Districts who received on-site monitoring visits during the 2007 – 2008 school year were excluded from consideration for monitoring this year in order to give them adequate time to implement their Corrective Action Plans:

SPP Indicators	LCSD #2 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding LCSD #2
#3C Secondary Reading Proficiency	20.00%	28.27%
#3C Secondary Math Proficiency	31.11%	34.43%

In terms of the variables that are included in the weighted formula, LCSD #2 scored below the state rate on both. In addition, when compared to other medium districts, the district's reading proficiency rate was the sixth lowest, and its mathematics reading proficiency rate was the seventh lowest among districts in that population group. When these proficiency rates were combined and compared to other medium districts, LCSD #2's score was one of the two lowest of eligible districts, and it was selected for an on-site monitoring visit.

After a district has been selected for on-site monitoring, the WDE then analyzes district data to determine potential areas of noncompliance that may account for the district's performance. For example, if a school had low performance in math and low rates of regular class placement, the question of whether children had access to the general curriculum might be reviewed.

Focused Monitoring Conditions for Laramie County School District #2

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed the district's data from a variety of sources including the WDE-425 (December 1) and WDE-427 (July 1) data collections, assessment data (PAWS and PAWS-ALT), stable and risk-based self-assessment data, and discipline data from the WDE-630 and 631. The data led the WDE to create hypotheses in two areas: 1) FAPE – Educational Benefit and 2) Child Find – Overidentification of Emotional Disability.

1. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was based on the district's relatively low PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities.

- 2. Child Find – Overidentification of ED** This hypothesis was based on the district's comparatively high identification rate of students with an Emotional Disability.

Details regarding the development of both hypotheses and information on how the WDE determined its samples for them are found below in the introduction to each finding area.

In addition to the two hypotheses chosen for on-site focused monitoring, the WDE also monitored other areas for IDEA compliance through a procedural compliance review of each file reviewed during testing of the aforementioned hypotheses. Results of the review are included with this report in Appendix A. Appendix B contains the results of a parent survey that was conducted in the district during a four-week window that included the dates of the on-site monitoring visit.

Results of On-Site Monitoring for Laramie #2

These areas were monitored on-site through a focused file review, staff interviews, and classroom observations, as deemed necessary. Each area is defined by statute, summarized by evidence gathered on-site, and a finding of noncompliance listed as applicable.

Area 1: FAPE – Educational Benefit

A. Citation

§300.101 Free appropriate public education (FAPE).

(a) General. A free appropriate public education must be available to all children residing in the State between the ages of 3 and 21, inclusive, including children with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled from school, as provided for in §300.530(d).

(c) Children advancing from grade to grade. (1) Each State must ensure that FAPE is available to any individual child with a disability who needs special education and related services, even though the child has not failed or been retained in a course or grade, and is advancing from grade to grade. (2) The determination that a child described in paragraph (a) of this section is eligible under this part, must be made on an individual basis by the group responsible within the child's LEA for making eligibility determinations.

§300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP.

(b) Review and revision of IEPs—(1) General. Each public agency must ensure that, subject to paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(3) of this section, the IEP Team—

(i) Reviews the child's IEP periodically, but not less than annually, to determine whether the annual goals for the child are being achieved; and

(ii) Revises the IEP, as appropriate, to address—

(A) Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals described in §300.320(a)(2), and in the general education curriculum, if appropriate;

(B) The results of any reevaluation conducted under §300.303;

(C) Information about the child provided to, or by, the parents, as described under §300.305(a)(2);

(D) The child's anticipated needs; or

(E) Other matters.

B. Evidence

1. Data

As previously mentioned in the introduction of this report, the WDE noted that PAWS proficiency rates among students with disabilities in Laramie #2 were below the overall state rates for both language arts and mathematics. Digging deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 38 of the district's students with disabilities scored Below Basic on at least one of the PAWS subtests (reading, writing, mathematics). The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

2. File Review

Using these 38 students as its purposeful sample, the WDE reviewed special education files as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, nine students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Three students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- Two students moved or transferred out of the district.
- Two students exited special education after being found no longer eligible for services.
- One student was removed from the sample when the team learned that he/she did not score Below Basic on any 2008 PAWS subtest.
- One student dropped out of school.

This reduction left 29 students remaining in the sample. Each of the remaining files exhibited one or more of the following characteristics, prompting the WDE to further examine these student situations:

- 14 of the 29 files exhibited a “disconnect” between needs identified in assessment reports and the needs listed in the IEP. In other words, not all of the student needs identified through the evaluation process were included in these students' IEPs.
- 13 out of 29 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 20 of the 29 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- 1 of the 29 files noted a lack of adequate or expected progress toward at least one of the student's IEP goals. However, this file contained evidence that the IEP team had recently reconvened to address the student's lack of progress.
- In 19 of the 29 files, the student's level of progress was unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 5 of the 29 IEPs were implemented recently and had not yet reached the first progress reporting period.
- 17 out of 29 files stated that accommodations were to be provided on an “as needed,” “teacher request,” “per student/teacher,” “at teacher discretion” or other similar basis, indicating an unclear commitment to the delivery of these supports.
- 1 of the 29 files contained reports showing that the student was failing more than one core academic course (mathematics, language arts, science, and/or social studies).

3. Interviews

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed special education staff, general education teachers, and related service providers regarding these 29 specific students. Through the interview process, 18 additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding 9 of the 18 students, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were now making progress and receiving educational benefit.
- For 7 of the 18 students, those interviewed were able to provide compelling evidence that these students' needs were in fact being adequately addressed through the provision of special education and related services. In most of these cases, the students' needs had changed since the most recent triennial evaluation.
- For two students who appeared to not have a goal in one or more areas of need, staff explained how particular IEP goals corresponded directly to the needs in question.

These reductions left eleven students remaining in the subsample. The following comments made by district staff lend further support for a finding in this area:

- Regarding one student who receives Speech Language services, a staff member reported, "I think (student) could use help in academics but he didn't qualify. I couldn't believe it."
- A teacher agreed that a student could benefit from using graphic organizers or other supports to maintain focus and improve performance at school. However, the same teacher was not familiar with any of the student's accommodations as listed in the IEP.
- A special educator reported that one student has "been a little off for a couple months compared to last year" and "(student) is a kid that concerns me." No progress reports could be located for the student, and the IEP team had not reconvened or amended the student's program.
- When asked about a student's general, non-individualized goal in the area of reading, a teacher replied, "The whole class reads below grade level."
- According to one staff member, one particular student's "biggest problem is communicating appropriately and organization." However, organization issues are not addressed in the IEP.
- When a special education teacher was asked about a student's math needs, he/she stated, "(Student) did not qualify in math using the discrepancy, but he needs it. With (student) not qualifying in the discrepancy, (he/she) wouldn't get a goal."
- For one particular student, a service provider mentioned that he/she would "like to be addressing other things" in the IEP, but the crafting of the student's goals was dominated by a single member of the IEP team.
- A general education teacher stated that one student had "fallen off hard this semester"; yet the IEP team had not reconvened to address the student's lack of progress. When asked about the procedure followed when a student with an IEP fails to make progress, the teacher replied, "I can't think of anything we've done except talk to the special ed teachers."

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in LCSD #2 are not always provided in accordance with the F APE requirements established in §§300.101 and 300.324. The district will be required to address this finding and correct the noncompliance through the development and implementation of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

Area 2: Child Find – Overidentification of Emotional Disability

A. Citation

§ 300.111 Child find.

(a) General. (1) *The State must have in effect policies and procedures to ensure that—*

(i) All children with disabilities residing in the State, including children with disabilities who are homeless children or are wards of the State, and children with disabilities attending private schools, regardless of the severity of their disability, and who are in need of special education and related services, are identified, located, and evaluated; and

(ii) A practical method is developed and implemented to determine which children are currently receiving needed special education and related services.

(c) Other Children in Child Find. *Child find also must include (1) Child who are suspected of being a child with a disability under §300.8 and in need of special education, even though they are advancing from grade to grade; and (2) Highly mobile children, including migrant children.*

(d) Construction. *Nothing in the Act requires that children be classified by their disability so long as each child who has a disability that is listed in § 300.8 and who, by reason of that disability, needs special education and related services is regarded as a child with a disability under Part B of the Act.*

§300.8 Child with a disability.

(4)(i) Emotional disturbance *means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a child's educational performance:*

(A) An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors.

(B) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers.

(C) Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances.

(D) A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression.

(E) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.

(ii) Emotional disturbance includes schizophrenia. The term does not apply to children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they have an emotional disturbance under paragraph (c) (4) (i) of this section.

§ 300.304 Evaluation procedures.

(a) Notice. *The public agency must provide notice to the parents of a child with a disability, in accordance with § 300.503, that describes any evaluation procedures the agency proposes to conduct.*

(b) Conduct of evaluation. *In conducting the evaluation, the public agency must—*

(1) Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the child, including information provided by the parent that may assist in determining—

(i) Whether the child is a child with a disability under § 300.8; and

(ii) The content of the child's IEP, including information related to enabling the child to be involved in and progress in the general education curriculum (or for a preschool child, to participate in appropriate activities);

(2) Not use any single measure or assessment as the sole criterion for determining whether a child is a child with a disability and for determining an appropriate educational program for the child; and

(3) Use technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors.

(c) Other evaluation procedures. Each public agency must ensure that—

(1) Assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under this part—

(i) Are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis;

(ii) Are provided and administered in the child's native language or other mode of communication and in the form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is clearly not feasible to so provide or administer;

(iii) Are used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable;

(iv) Are administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel; and

(v) Are administered in accordance with any instructions provided by the producer of the assessments.

(2) Assessments and other evaluation materials include those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely those that are designed to provide a single general intelligence quotient.

(3) Assessments are selected and administered so as best to ensure that if an assessment is administered to a child with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the assessment results accurately reflect the child's aptitude or achievement level or whatever other factors the test purports to measure, rather than reflecting the child's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills (unless those skills are the factors that the test purports to measure).

(4) The child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status, and motor abilities;

(5) Assessments of children with disabilities who transfer from one public agency to another public agency in the same school year are coordinated with those children's prior and subsequent schools, as necessary and as expeditiously as possible, consistent with § 300.301(d)(2) and (e), to ensure prompt completion of full evaluations.

B. Evidence

1. Data

According to the combined December 2007 and July 2008 (WDE-425 and WDE-427) data collections, Laramie #2's identification rate of students with an Emotional Disability (ED) was approximately 13%. This was notably higher than the comparable state rate of about 8%. Curiously, four of the of the district's students with an Emotional Disability were not receiving Counseling (CS), Psychological Services (PS), and/or Social Work (SW) as related services, and two others scored Proficient or Advanced on two or more

PAWS subtests in the spring of 2008. The WDE hypothesized that some of the district's students who are currently identified as having an Emotional Disability might meet the state's eligibility criteria in another disability category or that some of these students might not truly meet the eligibility criteria for ED.

2. File Review

In probing this hypothesis, the WDE created a purposeful sample comprised of the six students described under Section B1 above. All were identified as having an Emotional Disability and only two of the six were receiving related services in the areas of Counseling (CS), Psychological Services (PS), and/or Social Work (SW).

Once on-site at LCSD #2, the WDE reviewed these six students' special education files to determine whether or not each student had been accurately identified as having an Emotional Disability. Through the file review process, one of the six students was removed from the sample when the team learned that this student had graduated in the spring of 2008. The five remaining students were also removed from the sample through the file review process, since there was no evidence in their files to suggest the students were incorrectly found eligible for services under the Emotional Disability criteria.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find Laramie #2 noncompliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to Child Find was not substantiated through the on-site file review process. The district is not required to address this area in its Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

D. Recommendation

The WDE declines to make a recommendation in this area. It appears the district is correctly identifying students with Emotional Disabilities under the appropriate state and federal eligibility criteria.

OTHER AREAS OF POTENTIAL NONCOMPLIANCE

A. Procedural Compliance File Review

Each member of the WDE monitoring team had the responsibility of conducting a procedural compliance check on each active file reviewed during the on-site visit. In sum, 37 files were included in this review. In Appendix A of this report, these results may be found. For any file review item in which the district's compliance is below 95%, the WDE requires that the district evidence correction of the noncompliance in a Corrective Action Plan and conduct additional self assessment to assure full compliance in these areas. More detailed guidance is provided on the CAP form.

B. Parent Survey Results

As part of the monitoring process, the WDE developed a Parent Survey in order to provide all parents an opportunity to give input on their children's special education experiences in Laramie #2. The Department mailed a hard copy of the Parent Survey and a cover letter to each parent of a student currently receiving special education services in the district. Parents had the option of completing the survey on paper or completing it online. A total of 134 surveys were mailed, and 27 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (20.15%). In Appendix B of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

File Review 1102000	Number of files reviewed	Percent of files compliant
B. Most Recent Evaluation / Reevaluation		
B1. The file contains a current evaluation	37	100.00 %
B2. The file contains documentation that a reevaluation was conducted by the public agency at least once in the past three years .(300.303(b)(2))	37	97.30 %
B5. Prior written notice includes a description of the action the public agency is proposing or refusing. (300.503(b)(1))	37	97.30 %
B17. The initial evaluation/reevaluation includes a variety of assessment tools and strategies that provide relevant information that directly assist persons in determining the educational needs of the child and is administered by qualified evaluators. (300.304(b)(1)), (300.304(b)(2), (300.204(c)(7))	37	100.00 %
B19. As part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the IEP team reviewed current classroom based, local or state assessments. (300.305(a)(1)(ii))	37	100.00 %
B22. The file contains documentation that, as part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status and motor abilities. (300.304)(c)(4))	37	94.59 %
C. Eligibility Determination		
C6. In the evaluation/ reevaluation, the file documents whether the child has or continues to have a disability, the present level of academic achievement and related developmental needs of the child, whether the child continues to need special education and related services and whether additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed. (300.305(a)(2))	37	100.00 %
C9. There is documentation that the public agency provided a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility determination to the parent. (300.306(a)(2))	37	91.89 %
E. The IEP Process		
E2. The file contains a current written IEP that was completed prior to the ending date of the previous IEP.(300.323(a))	37	81.08 %
E13. The IEP includes documentation if the student is being removed from general education for any part of the school day, such removal occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of modifications, supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (300.114(a)(2)(ii))	37	78.38 %
E20. The IEP includes a statement of special education and related services and any supplementary aids and services to enable the child to advance toward attaining the annual goals involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum and be educated and participate with other children with and without disabilities.	37	94.59 %
E24. If the child participates in the alternate assessment the IEP contains a statement of why the child cannot participate in the regular assessment. (300.320(a)(6)(ii)(A))	37	100.00 %
E26. The IEP includes the child's present levels of academic and functional performance including how the child's disability affects his/her progress in the general curriculum (or for preschool children, participation in appropriate activities). (300.320(a)(1)(i)), (300.320(a)(1)(ii))	37	89.19 %

File Review --- Trained reviewers' assesment of files Percent of "Yes" responses on each item	Number of files with a yes/no response	Percent of Yes responses
E27. The IEP includes measurable annual academic, developmental and functional goals designed to meet the needs of the child and enable the child to progress in the general curriculum. (300.320(a)(2)(i)(A)), (300.324(a)(iv))	37	48.65 %
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	37	75.68 %
E33. The IEP documents that the public agency has informed each regular education teacher, special education teacher, related service provider and other service provider who is responsible for its implementation of his or her specific responsibilities including accommodations, modifications and supports. (300.323(d)(2))	37	64.86 %
E45. If the parent did not attend the IEP meeting there is documentation of more than one attempt to arrange a mutually agreed upon time, place and format. (300.322(c)), (300.322(d)), (300.328), (300.501(b))	37	97.30 %
E46. The file contains documentation that the public agency conducted a meeting to develop the initial IEP within 30 calendar days of a determination that a child with a disability was found eligible for special education and related services. (300.323(c)(1))	37	97.30 %
F. TRANSFERS		
F1. If a child with a disability transferred from a public agency within the same academic year, and had an IEP that was in effect in Wyoming, the file contains documentation that the public agency in consultation with the parents, provided FAPE to the child including services comparable to those described in the previously held IEP. (300.323(e)), (300.501(b))	37	100.00 %
F2. If a child with a disability who transferred from a public agency within the same academic year, and had an IEP that was in effect in another State, the file contains documentation that the public agency in consultation with the parents, provided FAPE to the child including services comparable to those described in the previously held IEP; until such time as the public agency conducts and evaluation, if determined to be necessary and develops a new IEP if appropriate. (300.323(f)), (300.501(b))	37	100.00 %
G. ESY		
G1. The file contains a parent notice that ESY services will be considered	37	16.22 %

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Results for
Laramie County School District #2**

Total Respondents: 27
Total Parents who were mailed a survey = 134
Response Rate = 20.15%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Agree, Strongly Agree, Very Strongly Agree
1. At Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, we talk about whether my child needs special education services during the summer or other times when school is not in session.	7%	0%	7%	22%	52%	11%	85%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	0%	0%	7%	22%	48%	22%	92%
3. My child's educational needs are being adequately addressed by the school.	0%	7%	15%	11%	52%	15%	78%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	4%	4%	7%	33%	44%	7%	84%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.	4%	4%	15%	23%	42%	12%	77%

6. Does your child receive counseling, social work, or psychological services at school? 6a. If no, do you think that your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? See additional pages for responses. 6b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 48%	No 48%	Don't Know 4%
7. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her educational needs and improve your child's progress in school? 7a. If yes, what could the school be doing? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 37%	No 48%	Don't Know 15%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Agree, Strongly Agree, Very Strongly Agree	State results (% who agreed)
8. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	7%	4%	30%	33%	15%	11%	59%	50%
9. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.	0%	0%	4%	26%	26%	44%	96%	90%
10. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	0%	4%	19%	19%	30%	30%	78%	84%
11. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	4%	0%	15%	19%	46%	15%	80%	76%
12. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	4%	4%	15%	37%	22%	19%	78%	68%

13. Any other comments that you would like to share?
[See additional pages for responses.](#)

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Open-Ended Comments for
Laramie County School District #2**

6. Does your child receive counseling, social work, or psychological services at school?

6a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services?

- He doesn't need any personal counseling but his class does have the school counselor in his classroom often.
- No
- No, I don't think it is necessary now, but I could see where it might be beneficial in the future.
- No.
- Some counseling.
- This is difficult because the school district and I disagree on what [REDACTED] needs.
- Yes.
- Your question doesn't make sense. What devices? The list are of services. If you are asking does my child receive AAC devices through the school and if that is adequate then the answer is still no. The answer to this portion of the question would then be yes my child would benefit from having AAC type devices provided and utilized at the school setting.

6b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child?

- I think it is the right amount.
- Counseling was added to my child's IEP, but I have received no feedback.
- I think he gets what he needs.
- No.
- Yes he could use more on getting ready for life.
- Yes.
- Yes, they are adequate.

7. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her educational needs and improve your child's progress in school?

7a. If yes, what could the school be doing?

- Don't move the special education program to Carpenter.
- First of all most people at his school did know my child was even on an IEP. 2nd they wanted to do a BIT meeting. And thirdly they are not following thru with what we discussed. At his IEP, meeting, even after numerous phone calls to different staff. Minutes need to be taken by the school at all IEP meetings for reference.
- My child is failing in most of his course work and needs help!
- My child's school district has personnel that are supposed to be professionals in their fields. They however, can choose to work with my child if they choose to or not based on whether they agree to what the IEP team decides my child's needs are. I have never in my life know of an employer who allowed an employee to decide what part of the job they will and won't do but it happens in LCSD #2 often. The special education teachers do not have appropriate mentors. When the blind leads the blind you only get stumbling around.

- Protecting more from the bully's there. It is an up and down thing and constantly ongoing. They will stop someone for a while and then it goes on.
- Some time more test in modular otherwise very good progress.
- The school can't admit that [REDACTED] needed to go to BOCES where he is now getting what he needs. [REDACTED] has severe RAD and this makes him hard to deal with on top of his cognitive deficits. He is tested at 1st grade instructional yet they want him to do grade level work.
- The school expects my child to come to them when help is needed, but my child is reluctant in asking for help. I feel the school should make more effort in monitoring those children that need special(extra) help.

13. Any other comments that you would like to share?

- Have staff trainings for them to help educate teachers on different needs of the child. Such as training on ADD/ADHD, autism, etc. They need more education on special needs!
- I am still uncomfortable with the climate at BHS. My son needs to be supervised from the moment he gets to the campus until he leaves, to protect him from bullies and to keep him from getting himself in trouble. I have had to fight all 3 years we have been at LD, 2 to get anyone to listen to be about this. After 3 years, it seems they can supervise him some, but then other times he is alone. What gives? I am also uncomfortable when someone tells him he is tattling regarding bullying. How come the special ed staff are privy to his information but regular ed teachers are left in the dark. They are usually the ones complaining that he is tattling, when they are the ones who are supposed to be supervising him at those times. I am also uncomfortable with how long it took to get LD to actually try to make a program that would help my son learn. As stated, we have been here 3 years. He is finally learning to read. He should have been put at expanded standards when we arrived and th
- I have concerns about the decision to move my daughter to Carpenter Elementary when they have the new addition completed in Carpenter. I want her to remain at West Elementary. She loves it there and is getting a great education. She doesn't transition well with change and to move to Carpenter would set her behind. It is also a lot farther from our home and our workplace.
- I really think [REDACTED] would really benefit from working at school this summer.
- I understand that it is [REDACTED] right to be intergraded into regular classrooms, but what if that's not best for him. Why must he be forced. [REDACTED] gets frustrated when asked to read and do work above his understanding. Frankly I don't blame him. He is happy at BOCES but district #2 feels they can provide his educational needs. I disagree. We had to get a court order so he could go. I don't understand.
- I want an open communication with the school and have asked that they contact me when concerns arise, but they don't, so I don't feel I am being kept informed of my child's progress since our parent/school IEP meeting. More communication needs to take place from the school.
- I'm not very happy with the test they take (dibbles) to verify if they need help or not. It seems more concerned with speed than comprehension of what they read.
- Please help my son he is wanting help. He tells me he asks for help at school for study to pass and it is not there.
- The PBHS is a very good school for my kids. Thanks much to PBHS.
- The PBHS is a very good school for my kids. They had help me through a lot. Thanks much.
- The PBHS is a very good school for my kids. They help me through a lot. I like to thank them.
- The special education process in LCSD#2 needs to be looked at in-depth and brought into line in many areas. The paperwork on several IEP's that I have had access to is unbelievable with errors. The administrator at one of the buildings is a bully and makes

inappropriate comments about children with disabilities as well as discusses these things at home with his wife and children. One of the special education teachers in the district is also a bully and is lead by example from the administrator. I have witnessed on several occasions where children have been "backed into a corner" just so the adults can throw them out of the school and not have to deal with them anymore. I would hope that when the WDE comes to LCSD#2 they examine this district with a fine toothed comb and improve what is happening here.

- ██████ is not cared for at his school in the manner that he needs to be. LD 2 chose to not listen to me and now ██████ has to go to BOCES in order to have services. How come he can't sleep in his own bed and go to his own school? They chose to ignore his needs, did not let me show them how to get him under control and gave up on him. Their answer to ██████ was to put him off to BOCES. Yet they think that because he has made a little progress there that they are then off the hook - that they have met his needs...I don't see how him sleeping 4 hours away with strangers every night meets his needs!
- The faculty at Pine Bluffs Schools are very good and am very satisfied with my children being there.
- No.

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Demographics for
Laramie County School District #2**

Ethnicity	N	%
White	21	84%
Hispanic	4	16%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Autism	3	12%
Emotional Disability	5	20%
Other Health Impairment	7	28%
Specific Learning Disability	3	12%
Multiple Disabilities	1	4%
Orthopedic Impairment	1	4%
Speech/Language Impairment	5	20%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten	3	12%
Grades 1-6	9	36%
Grades 7-8	8	20%
Grades 9-12	5	20%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	16	64%
Resource Room	5	20%
Separate Classroom	1	4%