

# Wyoming Department of Education Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Report

**Platte County School District #1**

**School Year: 2010 – 2011**

**Date of On-Site Review: November 16 – 19, 2010**

## **Introduction**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Regulations include the following provision: *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 [34 C.F.R. §300.600].*

## **Process**

### **A. Performance Indicator Selection**

Consistent with the requirements established in 34 C.F.R §§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. To assist the WDE in its fulfillment of these requirements, the Department solicited input from its General Supervision Stakeholder Group<sup>1</sup> during the fall of 2010. The Stakeholder Group assisted in setting the priority indicators and scoring system to be used in determining which districts would be selected for on-site monitoring.

As stated previously, IDEA places a strong emphasis on positive educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities ages three through 21. This emphasis greatly influenced the selection of three key indicators of student performance from the State Performance Plan as priorities for the Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring (CIFM) process. The ultimate goal of the CIFM process is to promote systems change which will positively influence educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

With input from the stakeholder group, the WDE created a two-part district selection formula using districts' results for State Performance Plan Indicators 3C (statewide assessment proficiency rates) and 5B (placement of students in Self-Contained or Separate Classroom settings). Specifically, the Department calculated the change in PAWS proficiency rates for grades 3-6 in reading from 2007 to 2009 for special

---

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

education students versus the same change for general education students. This provided the WDE with a measure of districts' success in closing the achievement gap between students with IEPs and their nondisabled peers. The WDE did the same for grades 7-8, and then took the mean of the gap score for grades 3-6 and the gap score for grades 7-8. This score (the Mean Gap Score) is the first component of the 2010 – 2011 CIFM district selection formula.

For Indicator 5B, the Department included each district's Self-Contained placement rate for students identified as having a primary disability category of Cognitive Disability, Emotional Disability and Multiple Disabilities. The WDE took the Mean Gap Score for Indicator 3C plus the Indicator 5B rate to yield a total score for each of the state's 48 school districts. Districts with the lowest scores in each population group—plus one randomly-selected district—were been selected for on-site monitoring visits.

## B. Individual District Selection

To improve its district selection process, the WDE has divided the state's 48 school districts 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

Platte County School District #1 (PCSD #1) is considered a medium school district and reported a special education population of 183 students on its 2010 WDE-427 report. Thus, the district's 2009 – 2010 special education data were ranked against data from all other medium districts for the same time period. Districts with the lowest scores 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 2009 – 2010 school year were excluded from consideration for monitoring this year in order to give them adequate time to implement their Corrective Action Plans. Districts that are in a compliance agreement (or have recently cleared findings that were addressed in a compliance agreement) were not excluded from consideration.

Measurement	Platte #1	State (minus Platte #1)
<i>Number students on July 2010 427 File</i>	183	15,143
A. Difference in IEP students' reading proficiency rates, grade 3-6, Proficiency 2009 minus Proficiency 2007	-13.15	-10.57
B. Difference in all students' reading proficiency rates, grade 3-6, Proficiency 2009 minus Proficiency 2007	2.71	-10.73
C. Difference: A - B	-15.86	0.16

D. Difference in IEP students' reading proficiency rates, grade 7-8, Proficiency 2009 minus Proficiency 2007	-9.88	-5.87
E. Difference in all students' reading proficiency rates, grade 7-8, Proficiency 2009 minus Proficiency 2007	-4.28	-10.65
F. Difference: D - E	-5.60	4.78
G. Average of C and F	-10.73	2.47
H. Percentage of students with CD, ED, or MU disability codes in SC environment*	53.33	68.54
Total Points (H. + G.)	<b>42.60</b>	<b>71.01</b>

*\*reversed scored; lower scores are desirable on these measures*

In terms of the statewide assessment variables that are included in the selection formula, Platte #1 data demonstrate growth for students *without* disabilities at the elementary reading level. However, proficiency rates for students with disabilities were lower in 2009 than they were in 2007 for those at elementary and middle school grade levels. The average “gap” in PAWS reading proficiency rates between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers at these grade levels widened by almost eleven percentage points from 2007 to 2009 (Row G above). In contrast, the comparable gap for Wyoming’s total population of elementary and middle school students narrowed by almost 2.5% during the same time period.

The data included for the Least Restrictive Environment variable (Row H above) also played a role in the selection of Platte #1 for an on-site monitoring visit. According to the district’s 2010 WDE-427 report, Platte #1 has 46.66% of its students with Cognitive Disabilities (CD), Emotional Disabilities (ED), or Multiple Disabilities (MU) placed in Self-Contained or Separate Classroom (SC) environments. In contrast, the state’s overall rate on the same measure stood at 31.46% during the same time period. When the WDE combined the district’s statewide assessment improvement data with this LRE data, Platte #1’s total score was the lowest of eligible districts in the medium population group. As such, the district was selected for an on-site visit from the Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring team.

It should be noted that the district’s performance on these measures is not conclusive evidence of special education noncompliance. After a district has been selected for on-site monitoring, the WDE then fully analyzes district data to determine potential areas of noncompliance that may account for the district’s performance. For example, if a school had low PAWS proficiency rates in mathematics and low rates of regular class placement, the question of whether or not children had access to the general curriculum might be reviewed. A finding of noncompliance can only be made through the WDE’s CIFM system if multiple pieces of objective information point to the same conclusion.

### **Focused Monitoring Conditions for Platte County School District #1**

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed Platte #1 data from a variety of sources including the WDE-425 and WDE-427 data collections, assessment data (PAWS and PAWS-ALT) from 2006 through 2009, stable and risk-based self-

assessment data, and discipline data from the WDE-636. In its review of data, the WDE focused on those pieces of information that are most closely related to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. This led the WDE to create four hypotheses related to the district's provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment:

1. **FAPE – Low Incidence Disabilities** This hypothesis was selected for review in all districts receiving CIFM visits during the 2010 – 2011 school year due to troubling statewide outcomes data for students in particular disability categories.
2. **Least Restrictive Environment** This hypothesis was formulated due to the district's comparatively high percentage of students with disabilities placed in Resource Room, Separate Classroom, and Separate Facility environments, especially at particular grade levels.
3. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was developed due to the district's comparatively low PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities, particularly in certain disability categories.
4. **Evaluation Procedures** This hypothesis was developed due to the district's notable number of students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD) at the kindergarten, first, and second grade levels.

Details regarding the development of each hypothesis 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 hypotheses chosen for on-site focused monitoring, the WDE also conducted a parent survey in the district during a four-week window that included the dates of the on-site monitoring visit. Results of the parent survey are included with this report as Appendix A.

## **Results of On-Site Monitoring for Platte #1**

The WDE monitored these areas on-site through a focused file review and staff interviews. Each area begins with a description of the data that underpinned the hypothesis, a summary of evidence gathered in the district, and the WDE's compliance determination with findings of noncompliance if applicable.

### **Area 1: FAPE – Low Incidence Disabilities**

#### **A. Data**

During its annual statewide data review, the WDE noted that students in particular "low incidence" disability categories appeared to be disproportionately represented in negative outcomes data reports. In particular, the data showed that no more than 1.2% of students with disabilities placed in Regular Education (RE) environments carried an eligibility label of Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Hearing Impairment (HI), Multiple Disabilities (MU), or Visual Impairment (VI). Students in these categories were also less likely to graduate with a regular diploma and appeared to be over-represented among

students with disabilities who dropped out of school<sup>2</sup> from 2006 – 2010. The WDE decided to explore the provision of FAPE to students in these categories on each of the 2010 – 2011 on-site CIFM visits.

## **B. Methodology**

### **1. File Review**

In planning the visit, the WDE crafted a purposeful sample comprised of all students in Platte #1 who have a reported disability code of BI, HI, MU, or VI. After arriving in Wheatland, the WDE monitoring team reviewed these eight students' special education files as the first step in the team's exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, five 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.
- One student moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student had passed away.

Thus, three students remained in the sample. Each of the remaining files exhibited one or more of the following violations of federal special education regulations, prompting the WDE to further examine these student situations:

- 2 of the 3 files contained a current IEP that did not incorporate all of the student needs identified through the teams' evaluation reports [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1), 300.324(a)(1 – 2)].
- 1 of the 3 files contained a current IEP that did not contain annual goals addressing an area of need described in the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance section of the program [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(2)(i)].
- 1 of the 3 files contained a current IEP that included one or more annual goals that were not measurable [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)(i)].
- 1 of the 3 students' current IEP included a package of services that did not appear to enable the student to advance appropriately toward meeting his/her annual goals [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(4)].
- 1 of the 3 students' progress reporting information was not clearly documented in the IEP [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)].
- According to progress reporting information in the files, all three of the students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more annual goal areas. For these three students, only one student's IEP team had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- For 1 of the 3 students, there was evidence that some IEP team members' concerns—including those of parents—had not been adequately addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].

---

<sup>2</sup> During the 2009 – 2010 school year, Wyoming had 513 students in these disability categories in its schools: 87 BI, 175 HI, 183 MU, and 68 VI. From the 2005 – 2006 school year through the 2009 – 2010 school year, 7 BI students, 7 HI students, 5 MU students, and 5 VI students dropped out of school (exit code 'DO'). Over these same five school years, 26 BI students, 23 HI students, 3 MU students, and 14 VI students graduated (exit code 'GD').

### **3. Interviews**

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed district special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these three specific students. Through the interview process, all three students were removed from the sample when the team learned that each of the student's needs were in fact being addressed adequately, and each was found to be making adequate progress in each goal area.

### **C. Finding**

The WDE does not find PCSD #1 noncompliant in this area. The WDE's compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – Low Incidence Disabilities was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district must correct violations of the related requirements discussed under section B1 above, but Platte #1 is not required to address Area 1 specifically through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

## **Area 2: Least Restrictive Environment**

### **A. Data**

In reviewing the district's most recent WDE-427 data, the Department noted that Platte #1 appeared to have a comparatively high percentage of students placed in Resource Room (RR) settings (39% compared to the state rate of 29%). Digging deeper into the district's data, the WDE noted that the district's representation of students with disabilities in RR and Separate Classroom (SC) settings was significantly higher among students in grades 3 – 5. For example, 73% of Platte #1's students in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade were placed in RR or SC settings; 54% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders were similarly placed, and 59% of 5<sup>th</sup> graders were in the same environment categories.

In addition, the WDE noted that Platte #1 had a rate of students placed in Separate Facility (SF) settings that was roughly double the state rate (3.36% vs. 1.66% for the overall state of Wyoming). The WDE hypothesized that some Platte #1 students currently placed in RR, SC, and SF settings—particularly in grades 3 through 5—could be successfully educated in less restrictive environments with the use of supplementary aids and services.

### **B. Methodology**

#### **1. File Review**

In preparation for the visit, the WDE created a purposeful sample of 42 students reportedly placed in RR, SC, or SF. 34 of these 42 students were enrolled in grades 3 through 5 during the 2009 – 2010 school year, while the remaining eight students were placed in Separate Facilities.

Once on-site in Wheatland, the WDE reviewed these 42 students' special education files in order to find out more about the IEP teams' rationale for each student's removal from the general education environment. Through the file review process, 39 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- 25 of the students' IEPs contained a clear, appropriate justification for their removal from general education settings.
- Nine students had moved or transferred out of the district.

- Two students had recently been moved to a less restrictive setting that is appropriately coded as Regular Environment (RE).
- Two students were placed outside of the school district by court order.
- One of the students had passed away.

This reduction left three students remaining in the sample. Each of the files in this subsample exhibited one or more of the following violations of federal special education regulations, prompting the WDE to further examine these student situations:

- All 3 files contained an inadequate or unclear rationale for the student's removal from the regular education environment [34 C.F.R. §§300.114(a)(2), 300.320(a)(5), 300.116].
- 2 of the 3 files contained no evidence that the IEP teams had considered a less restrictive environment for the students in question [34 C.F.R. §§300.114(a)(2), 300.115, 300.116(b – e)].
- For 1 of the 3 students, challenging behavior appeared to have been a factor in the placement decision. There was no evidence of a functional behavior assessment (FBA) in this student's case [34 C.F.R. §300.304(b – c), 300.114(a)(2), 300.115(b)(2), 300.116(b – e)].
- 1 of 3 files indicated that the students' communication difficulties were a factor in the placement decision. Although it appeared that the student's communication needs were being addressed adequately, it was unclear if/how the IEP team had attempted the use of supplementary aids and services in regular education environments prior to placing the student in a more restrictive setting [34 C.F.R. §§300.114(a)(2), 300.115(b)(2), 300.116(b – e)].
- For 1 of the 3 students, the WDE could not determine his/her levels of progress in the current setting due to unclear progress reports [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)].
- According to progress reporting information in the files, 1 of the 3 students was not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. There was no indication in the file that the student's IEP team had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].

## 2. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, WDE team members interviewed special education teachers, support staff, and related service providers regarding the learning environments for these three students. Through the interview process, all three students were removed from the sample when Platte #1 staff provided compelling evidence to explain why these IEPs could not be implemented in less restrictive environments even with the provision of supplementary aids and services.

## C. Finding

The WDE does not find PCSD #1 noncompliant in this area. The WDE's compliance hypothesis related to Least Restrictive Environment was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district must correct violations of the related requirements discussed under section B1 above, but Platte #1 is not required to address Area 2 specifically through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

## **Area 3: FAPE – Educational Benefit**

### **A. Data**

In reviewing Platte #1 statewide assessment data, the WDE team noticed some areas of concern related to proficiency rates for students with disabilities. In particular, students eligible for special education under the Emotional Disability (ED), Other Health Impairment (HL), Specific Learning Disability (LD), and Speech Language Impairment (SL) criteria appeared disproportionately represented among those scored 'Below Basic' during the 2009 PAWS administration. In fact, of the six students with disabilities who scored 'Below Basic' on all three 2009 PAWS subtests (reading, writing, mathematics), four were eligible under the LD criteria and two were eligible under the SL criteria.

In addition, the WDE noted that the district's 2009 PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities at the elementary level were below those of the state overall. However, the district's proficiency rates for students with disabilities at the high school level were higher than the comparable state rates in reading and mathematics; middle school proficiency rates were higher in math but lower in reading. Based on these aspects of the district's 2009 statewide assessment proficiency rates, the WDE hypothesized that some students in the district may have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

### **B. Methodology**

#### **1. File Review**

The WDE crafted a purposeful sample of 63 students with disabilities to use in its exploration of this hypothesis. 41 of the students in the sample were eligible under the ED, HL, LD or SL criteria, all of them scored below 'Proficient' on two or more of the 2009 PAWS subtests, and all were over the age of fifteen. The other 22 students scored below 'Proficient' on all three 2009 PAWS subtests and were age fourteen or younger.

Before beginning its review of these 63 students' files, the WDE team cross-referenced these WISER IDs against the results of its most recent Platte #1 verification visit, which occurred in May of 2010. In comparing these results to the proposed sample of 63 students, the WDE identified eighteen of the 63 students whose records had been reviewed and found compliant during the May 2010 visit. These eighteen students were thus removed from the November 2010 monitoring sample for this hypothesis, bringing the total sample down to 45 students with disabilities.

Once on-site in Wheatland, the WDE team reviewed these students' special education files and cumulative records as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, 39 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Fourteen students moved or transferred out of the district.
- Twelve students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- Six students graduated in the spring of 2010.
- Four students recently returned to the general education program after being found no longer eligible for special education services.
- Three students dropped out of school.



This reduction left six students remaining in the sample. Each of these six files exhibited one or more of the following violations of federal special education regulations, prompting the WDE to further examine these student situations:

- 1 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that did not incorporate all of the student needs identified through the teams' evaluation reports [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1), 300.324(a)(1 – 2)].
- 2 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that did not contain annual goals addressing an area of need described in the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance section of the program [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(2)(i)].
- 1 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that included one or more annual goals that were not measurable [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)(i)].
- 2 of the 6 students' progress reporting information was not clearly documented in the IEP [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)].
- According to progress reporting information in the files, 1 of the 6 students was not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. There was no documentation in the file to suggest the student's IEP team had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- For 1 of the 6 students, there was evidence that some IEP team members' concerns—including those of parents—had not been adequately addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].
- 4 of these 6 students (all four of whom were enrolled in secondary grades) had grades of 'D' or 'F' in at least one core academic course; response from the IEP team was unclear in each case [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1 – 2), 300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)].
- 2 of the 6 students' records reflected a poor attendance history; response from the IEP team was unclear in each case [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)].
- 1 out of 6 student records documented the occurrence of three or more behavior incidents during the 2010 – 2011 school year [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)].

## **2. Interviews**

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed district special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these six specific students. Through the interview process, three additional students were removed from the sample when those interviewed were able to provide compelling evidence that these students' needs were in fact being adequately addressed through special education and related services. In addition, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that all three of the students were now making progress and receiving educational benefit.

This reduction left three students remaining in the subsample. During interviews, district staff validated the WDE team's concerns about these students' lack of progress on particular IEP goals (and verified continued failing grades for two students), and confirmed that the respective IEP teams had yet to take action to address the lack of progress.

## **C. Finding**

Typically, the WDE makes systemic findings of noncompliance when three or more students remain in the sample through the conclusion of the interview process.

However, the WDE noted that all six students for whom interviews were conducted were enrolled in a single Platte #1 school. Thus, rather than making a district-wide finding of noncompliance in this area, the WDE requires that the district take action on behalf of the three students for whom a denial of FAPE was confirmed. The district may opt to reconvene these students' IEP teams or amend their programs: in either case, corrective action must be taken within 45 business days of the date of this report. The student's WISER ID numbers can be found in the report's cover letter. The respective IEP teams must 1) evaluate the student's current levels of progress, and 2) modify the IEPs to address the lack of progress. As proof of correction, the WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the IEP.

In addition, although the WDE's hypothesis related to FAPE – Educational Benefit was not fully substantiated, the district must correct violations of the related requirements discussed under section B1 above. However, Platte #1 is not required to address Area 3 specifically through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

## **Area 4: Evaluation Procedures and Eligibility Determinations**

### **A. Data**

In reviewing the district's most recent WDE-427 data, the Department noted that Platte #1 appeared to have a comparatively high number of students identified under the Specific Learning Disability (LD) eligibility criteria at the kindergarten, first, and second grade levels<sup>3</sup>. Because of the difficulty in obtaining severe discrepancies between current and expected achievement for young students, the WDE presumed that these students were likely to have been identified as meeting the LD criteria through the district's use of Response to Intervention (RTI). The WDE hypothesized that some students in primary grades who are eligible under the LD criteria might have been identified inappropriately or could be eligible for special education under other criteria.

### **B. Methodology**

In preparation for the visit, the WDE created a purposeful sample of nine students, all of whom were reportedly eligible under the Learning Disability criteria and enrolled in grades K through 2. Once on-site in Wheatland, the WDE reviewed these students' special education files in order to find out more about the evaluation procedures followed and eligibility determinations made in each case. Through the file review process, all nine students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Five students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- Three of the students' special education files revealed that they were also eligible under Wyoming's Speech Language Impairment (SL) criteria.
- One student's file contained an evaluation that appeared comprehensive, and the student clearly met the Developmental Delay eligibility criteria.

### **C. Finding**

---

<sup>3</sup> 23.53% of the district's students with disabilities in grades K through 2 were identified with Specific Learning Disabilities. Statewide, only 5.15% of students with disabilities in the same grades are reportedly eligible under the LD criteria.

The WDE does not find FCSD #6 noncompliant in this area. The WDE's compliance hypothesis related to Evaluation Procedures and Eligibility Determinations for students with Developmental Delays was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. Fremont #6 is not required to address Area 4 specifically on its Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

#### **D. Recommendation**

Under Wyoming's Chapter 7 Rules, a student can only be found eligible under the Developmental Delay criteria when he/she does not qualify in other categories but meets the DD criteria [see Chapter 7 Rules, Section 4(d)(iv)]. Fremont #6 is reminded that students who meet eligibility criteria in other categories should not be considered eligible under the DD criteria. Regardless of the category in which the student qualifies, the IEP must address all relevant educational domains in which the student has a need for special education and related services. The student's category of eligibility does not determine or narrow the scope of services the student can receive.

Dr. [REDACTED]

Absolutely not. It is a serious misunderstanding to think that we cannot reliably identify students with specific developmental dyslexia before age 9. Although I'm not sure at exactly what age I would be comfortable referring to a student as dyslexic, it is certainly before age 9, and might be as early as the middle of grade 1, assuming the child has had a good program of systematic and explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics beginning in kindergarten and extending powerfully through first grade. Rather than labeling a child as learning disabled, or dyslexic, at a very young age (because these labels may sometimes stick even if the problems are overcome through powerful instruction), I would prefer to see schools provide immediate and intensive interventions when they notice that any student is lagging behind in the development of critical early reading skills. The ideal would be that students do not need to be 'labeled' in order to receive instruction that is sufficiently powerful to meet their needs. However, in the real world, if this kind of powerful instruction is only available after a student has received a label that implies they are 'handicapped' in some way, then, if it was my child, and they fit the scenario described above, I would be comfortable with applying the 'reading disabled' label as early as the middle of first grade.

#### **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 Platte #1. 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. The WDE mailed a total of 455 surveys, and 85 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (18.68%). In Appendix A of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.