



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

CARBON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1

December 7 – 11, 2009

**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

Carbon County School District #1

School Year: 2009 – 2010

Date of On-Site Review: December 7 – 11, 2009

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 General Supervision Stakeholder Group¹ worked with the WDE Special Programs Unit in the fall of 2009 to set the priority indicators and 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 three key indicators of student performance from the State's 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.

Districts were selected for on-site monitoring through the application of a formula applied to all 48 districts' data using four variables. These variables are taken directly from Indicators 2, 3C, and 5 of the State Performance Plan (SPP), which can be viewed in its entirety at www.k12.wy.us. With Stakeholder Group input, the WDE slightly narrowed its focus in each of the indicator areas to include the following pieces of data in its selection formula:

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

- Indicator 2: combined dropout rate for students with disabilities over the past three years of available data (05-06, 06-07, and 07-08)
- Indicator 3C: 2009 PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities in 3rd grade reading and 8th grade mathematics
- Indicator 5: 2008 – 2009 combined rate of separate classroom (SC) and separate facility (SF) placements

For each district, the WDE Special Programs Unit calculated a total score using this formula. The Department then selected districts for on-site CIFM visits using the process described below in subsection B.

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

Carbon County School District #1 (CCSD #1) is considered a medium school district and reported a special education population of 287 students on its 2008 WDE-425 report. Thus, the district's 2008 – 2009 data were 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 2008 – 2009 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	CCSD #1 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding CCSD #1
Ind. 2: Combined Dropout Rate	12.57%	9.23%
Ind. 3C: 3 rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	36.36%	29.09%
Ind. 3C: 8 th Gr. Math Proficiency	27.78%	26.27%
Ind. 5: Combined SC and SF rates	6.97%	10.68%

In terms of the variables that are included in the formula, CCSD #1's data compared quite favorably to other medium districts and to the state on the Indicator 5 variable. Likewise, the district's 3rd grade PAWS reading proficiency rate was over seven percentage points higher than the overall state rate, and Carbon #1's 8th grade mathematics proficiency rate was also slightly higher than the state rate. However, the district's combined dropout rate was notably higher than the state rate. In the end, when the three-year dropout rate, these particular proficiency rates, and the placement data were combined and compared to other districts in the same population group, CCSD #1's score was one of the two lowest of eligible districts. Thus, the WDE selected Carbon #1 for an on-site Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring visit.

It should be noted that the district's performance on the key indicators is not direct evidence of noncompliance. 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 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 Carbon County School District #1

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed the district's most recent and trend 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-636. The data led the WDE to create hypotheses in two areas: 1) FAPE – Educational Benefit; and 2) FAPE – Extended School Year.

1. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was formulated due to the district's PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities.
2. **FAPE – Extended School Year** This hypothesis was based on the district's comparatively low percentage of students receiving Extended School Year services.

Details regarding the development of both hypotheses and information on how the WDE determined its samples for each 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 Carbon #1

These areas were monitored on-site through a focused file review, and staff interviews. 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 noted above in the introduction of this report, the WDE noted that 2009 PAWS proficiency rates among students with disabilities in Carbon #1 were below the overall state targets for both language arts and mathematics at all school levels. Probing deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 63 of the district's students with disabilities at any grade level scored 'Below Basic' on two or three PAWS subtests (reading, writing, and math).

In addition, district data identified seven additional students who had previously received speech and/or language services but currently were not receiving these services either as Speech Services (SS – Special Education) or Language Services (LS – Related Service). After reviewing these data, 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 the 70 students described above as its purposeful sample, the WDE reviewed these students' special education files as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, 34 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Seventeen students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- Fourteen students recently moved or transferred out of district.
- Two students had dropped out of school.
- One student returned to the program

This reduction left 36 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:

- 17 of the 36 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.
- 12 out of 36 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 18 of the 36 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- 9 out of 36 files contained a program of special education and related services that did not appear to address the student’s needs and goals adequately.
- 18 out of 36 files indicated that accommodations were to be provided on an “as needed,” “as appropriate,” “at student’s request,” or other similar basis, indicating an unclear commitment to the delivery of these supports and services.
- In 11 of 36 files, students demonstrated a lack of progress in one or more goal areas; In 7 of these 11 cases, there was no evidence that the respective IEP teams had reconvened or amended the programs in response to the students’ lack of progress.
- In 13 of the 36 files, the student’s levels of progress were unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 9 out of the 36 files contained IEP goals that had not changed meaningfully from the prior IEP to the current IEP.
- 3 of the 36 IEPs contained notes or meeting minutes reflecting at least one team member’s concerns that do not appear to be addressed.
- 18 of the 36 files indicated that the students received a grade of ‘D’ or ‘F’ in at least one core academic class (mathematics, language arts, science, or social studies).
- 8 of 36 student records documented frequent or extensive absences.
- 8 of 36 student records contained evidence of multiple disciplinary incidents.

3. Interviews

Following the file review, special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers were interviewed regarding these 36 specific students. Through the interview process, eighteen additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For ten students who appeared to be lacking goals in one or more areas of need, district staff explained how certain IEP goals did in fact address these students’ needs. Furthermore, each of these students was shown to be making adequate/expected progress.
- For nine of the students, 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 most of these cases, the students’ needs had changed since their most recent triennial evaluation.
- Regarding eight students, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were now making progress and receiving educational benefit.

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

- When discussing a student with documented behavioral and disciplinary issues, a district staff member reported, “[Student name] has emotional needs; [he/she] would benefit from counseling.” The student was not receiving counseling as a component of [his/her] current IEP.
- With regard to a student’s behavior plan and a possible need to reconvene given that the student is currently struggling with behavior, “I think [his/her] behavior plan needs to be revisited.” Said a staff member.
- For a student with an emotional disability, while discussing behavior and services, “That kid definitely needs psych services more than once every two weeks!”
- A staff member indicated that a student’s “distraction interfered with academic work.” This was also noted on the summary of evaluation and in the current PLAAFP; however there were no respective goals or services in the current IEP.
- A student’s IEP and Prior Written Notice documented the need for a particular student to continue ELL services. However, a service provider explained the student was not receiving ELL services this year due to scheduling issues that prevent any 4th graders in one school from receiving ELL services.
- When discussing a student’s attendance issues and poor progress, a district staff member stated, “[Student name] would be passing if [he/she] were here. Attendance could be a goal...it would be good for [him/her] to have an attendance goal.”
- After describing a student’s poor social skills and their effect on [his/her] progress, a staff member stated, “[He/She] should have a social skills goal.”
- When asked about a possible need for a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), a staff member responded, “[He/She] would probably benefit from one.” “[He/She] is failing now; [he/she] was doing well at the beginning of the year.”
- When asked about a certain student’s reading skills, a service provider said, “[He/She] would probably benefit from more reading instruction,” and added, “[His/Her] writing skills are horrible; reading skills are very low and [he/she] is not in Read 180.”
- For a student with transition goals and social skills deficits; a staff member commented, “[He/She] doesn’t understand social cues...can be loud and has perseveration issues. [He/She] would benefit from DVR job training, job coaching.”
- For a student whose IEP called for the implementation of a behavior intervention plan (BIP) across multiple environments, the WDE interviewed multiple staff members working with the student who were not familiar with the plan.
- While talking about a student’s lack of progress, a teacher commented, “[His/Her] skills are growing, but not as much as I would like to see. [Student name] may benefit more from a pull-out language arts class.”
- Regarding a student’s progress and noting that services didn’t appear to be meeting his/her needs, a staff member reported, “This kid is failing everything.” The IEP team had not reconvened.
- When asked why a student was doing poorly in class, the response was; “He/she has the skills, but [he/she] gets so far in the hole.” The IEP team had not reconvened in this student’s case.

- When asked if the team had conducted a Functional Behavior Assessment for a student who appeared to need one, a staff member stated, “[Student name] has no FBA...not sure if they (the district) have them.”
- Several staff indicated a particular student’s behavior has interfered with his/her learning since the 2008 – 2009 school year. A staff member stated, “I think there are social/emotional issues. Down the road, we need to look closer. We don’t want to miss it in [his/her] re-evaluation.” The student’s next evaluation is scheduled for the spring of 2011, and current programming does not include specific behavioral supports or services.
- When discussing a student with behavior issues, communication and social skills needs, a teacher described the team’s failure to address these needs by stating, “Teachers at [student’s] level just want to ‘know’ their subject.”

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in CCSD #1 are not always provided in accordance with the FAPE 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: FAPE – Extended School Year

A. Citation

§300.106(a) Extended School Year Services

(a) *General.*

(1) *Each public agency must ensure that extended school year services are available as necessary to provide FAPE, consistent with paragraph (a)(2) of this section.*

(2) *Extended school year services must be provided only if a child’s IEP Team determines, on an individual basis, in accordance with §§300.320 through 300.324, that the services are necessary for the provision of FAPE to the child.*

(3) *In implementing the requirements of this section, a public agency may not—*

(i) *Limit extended school year services to particular categories of disability; or*

(ii) *Unilaterally limit the type, amount, or duration of those services.*

(b) *Definition. As used in this section, the term extended school year services means special education and related services that—*

(1) *Are provided to a child with a disability—*

(i) *Beyond the normal school year of the public agency;*

(ii) *In accordance with the child’s IEP;*

(iii) *At no cost to the parents of the child; and*

(2) *Meet the standards of the SEA.*

B. Evidence

1. Data

According to the July 2009 WDE-4 27 data collection, approximately 7% of all students with disabilities in CCSD #1 received Extended School Year (ESY) services during the 2008 – 2009 school year. The WDE found this data noteworthy, especially when

comparing that percentage to the overall rate of students with disabilities receiving ESY in Wyoming. The statewide rate stood at approximately 9% during the same period.

2. File Review

The WDE created a purposeful sample of 29 students in Carbon #1 who did not receive ESY during the 2008 – 2009 school year. The sample was composed of students eligible for special education under one of the following disability categories: Autism (AT), Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Cognitive Disability (CD), Hearing Impairment (HI), and Multiple Disabilities (MU). The WDE hypothesized that some of them may need services beyond the regular school day and/or calendar in order to receive FAPE.

Once on-site in Rawlins, the WDE reviewed these 29 students' special education files. At the conclusion of the WDE's file review, twenty files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Eight student files contained IEPs that appeared reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit without the provision of ESY services.
- Seven students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- Two students had recently completed the school year in which they turned 21 years of age, exiting with certificates of completion.
- One student was in fact receiving Extended School Year services as a component of his/her current program.
- One student had dropped out of school.
- One student graduated in the spring of 2009.

For the remaining nine students, however, one or more of the following characteristics kept them in the sample:

- 4 of 9 files described student needs that could potentially be addressed through the provision of Extended School Year.
- 4 of 9 IEPs did not contain an annual goal for each area of need identified.
- 5 of 9 files contained one or more goals that are not measurable.
- 3 of 9 files contained services that did not appear to be adequate given the student's goals.
- In 2 of the 9 files, the students' levels of progress were unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 5 of the 9 files described the student's lack of progress in one or more goal areas; of these five files, three contained no evidence that the respective IEP teams had reconvened the IEP team or amended the students' programs to address the lack of progress.
- 3 of the 9 files contained current IEP goals that had not changed meaningfully from the prior IEPs.
- 1 of 9 files contained notes or minutes that reflect at least one team member's concerns about a need that could be addressed through extended school year services.

3. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, the WDE monitoring team interviewed resource room teachers, support staff, and related service providers regarding these nine

students' potential need for ESY. Through the interview process, five additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For four of the students, district staff presented compelling evidence that the students were making adequate progress and were not in need of ESY in order to receive FAPE.
- In one student's case, the district offered ESY services, but the parent refused them.

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

- When asked whether a high school student would benefit from services beyond the school year to further address the student's communication and transition goals (in which progress had been described as inadequate), a teacher responded, "summer services would be good to help (a student) develop interpersonal skills, a job coach would be good".
- A district staff member reported that ESY would benefit a particular student by including living skills and working on appropriate social behavior in addition to academics. The student's goals included social skills reasoning and communication, in addition to academics.
- A service provider stated that one particular student could benefit from ESY, since the student's disability contributes to regression in at least one related service area over summer.
- A teacher said, "I would definitely look at that (ESY) for [his/her] IEP. It is not identified on the IEP now, but going a whole summer without reading comprehension, [he/she] will lose ground."
- Regarding one particular student, a teacher reported that "retention (of skills/information) is [his/her] biggest problem." The teacher added, "I will recommend ESY; we are waiting to hear when summer school schedule is set. I will recommend ½ day, 4 days a week at the beginning of summer or end of summer."

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in CCSD # 1 are not always provided in accordance with the FAPE requirements established in §300.106. The district is required to address this finding and correct the noncompliance through the development and implementation of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

OTHER AREAS OF POTENTIAL NONCOMPLIANCE

A. General File Review

Each member of the WDE monitoring team also had the responsibility of conducting a procedural compliance check in each file reviewed during the on-site visit. In all, 77 files were reviewed for this purpose. In Appendix A of this report, these file review 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 (CAP) and conduct an 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 Carbon #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 294 surveys, and 41 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (15%). In Appendix B of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

File Review 0401000	Number of files reviewed	Percent of files compliant
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))	77	85.71%
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))	77	77.92%
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))	77	87.01%
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))	77	77.92%
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.	77	92.21%
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))	77	98.70%
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))	77	64.94%
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))	77	41.56%
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	77	98.70%
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))	77	84.42%
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))	77	97.40%

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))	77	98.70%
E47. The file contains prior written notice regarding the implementation of the current IEP. (§300.503)	77	7.79%
E48. The IEP documents that all of the required participants attended the IEP meeting -- parent, special education teacher of the child, general education teacher of the child, representative of the public agency (§300.321(a))	77	88.31%
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))	77	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))	77	97.40%

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Results for:
Carbon County School District #1**

Total Respondents: 41
Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 294
Returned due to invalid address: 16
Response rate: 15%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	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.	2%	5%	12%	27%	10%	42%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	0%	0%	2%	30%	22%	45%
3. My child's educational needs are being adequately addressed by the school.	0%	2%	10%	30%	22%	35%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	2%	0%	10%	27%	22%	37%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after school.	5%	0%	7%	30%	15%	42%

6. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her academic needs and improve your child's progress in school? 6a. If yes, what could the school be doing? <i>See next page for responses</i>	Yes 34%	No 51%	Don't Know 14%
7. Does your child receive any social, emotional, or behavioral services at school? 7a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? 7b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? <i>See next page for responses</i>	Yes 30%	No 60%	Don't Know 10%
8. Are there any additional supports, services, or equipment that would enable your child to spend more time in the regular classroom? 8a. If yes, please describe. <i>See next page for responses</i>	Yes 16%	No 48%	Don't Know 35%
9. Does your child receive Extended School Year (ESY) services? 9a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? 9b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? <i>See next page for responses</i>	Yes 10%	No 70%	Don't Know 20%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
10. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	9%	4%	21%	34%	9%	19%
11. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.	0%	0%	0%	36%	14%	48%
12. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	0%	0%	2%	33%	12%	51%
13. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	0%	0%	2%	45%	10%	42%
14. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	0%	2%	9%	31%	19%	36%

15. Any other comments that you would like to share?
See next page for responses

Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Results
Open-Ended Comments
Carbon County School District #1

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

6a. If yes, what could the school be doing?

Lighten the workload of the available counselors with additional support staff

- N/A
- Continuous feedback
- My child has an IEP for speech services only. He is extremely bright. I would like to see a Gifted & Talented program in our district.
- Better communication between regular classroom and special ed teachers is really needed....I think this is the most important change that could be made. If our daughter has problems in regular class it is usually me that her regular teacher talks to and then I tell the special ed teacher about it. It would be better for our daughter if when the regular classroom teacher does have problems with our daughter that she first talked with the special ed teacher. Usually the special ed teacher can easily and effectively come up with solutions to anything problem behavior our daughter may show in regular class. In most instances any behavior problems our daughter has are due to her learning difficulties, so of course her special ed teacher should be consulted right away.....At least that is how we feel. Also better communication between the teachers and the parents is needed and better communication between the special ed teacher and her supervisor are needed...For example, I asked during
- Offering after school tutoring
- Highland hills was lousy in doing for [REDACTED] - she is doing real well at the 6th grade Middle school with [REDACTED]
- At the beginning of the year have the new current teachers meet to discuss his needs, his IEP is in April and the teachers to start the next year are not up to speed on his needs. We usually have to tell them after we see it's not being done or he gets frustrated
- The school district could find the funds to hire a psychologist and not spend the 11 million on a new building
- instituting after school tutoring
- Too lax on meeting deadlines
- Provide special education services as indicated on her IEP; provide accommodations for anxiety and tourett
- Maybe more one on one time
- He needs his tests read to him- and his answers put down by educators. He needs a computer that talks to him for his spelling and reading education

7. Does your child receive any social, emotional, or behavioral services at school?

7a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services?

- No (x6 responses)
- No, my child has no social, emotional or behavioral issues. Very outgoing, people pleaser, kind, caring, happy child
- Yes

- Yes. My child has emotional problems due to the fact that his father will not have a relationship with him and he would benefit from receiving emotional services. My child has no friends in school and would benefit from receiving social services at school
- Yes, except more could be done with a psychologist
- Yes I do believe she would make more progress and emotional support
- Yes- my child is starting and continuing to show a lot of anger and emotional breakdowns over frustration

7b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child?

- No, on the amount-there needs to be more counselors
- Very appropriate
- Yes, I do because it will help him
- Yes, very appropriate
- He meets with the school counselor weekly. I would like to see more social skills learning opportunities outside of his visits with the counselor
- Yes (x 3 responses)
- I don't know. I only spoke to the school counselor at one IEP meeting and I have never heard anything since. She is supposed to have services 2 times a week I think. Our daughter doesn't talk to us about seeing the school counselor and if we ask her about it she doesn't remember talking to a school counselor. I think our daughter could use more help as she has developed new problems since school began because of a bully problem

8. Are there any additional supports, services, or equipment that would enable your child to spend more time in the regular classroom?

8a. If yes, please describe.

- The supports are listed on his IEP. More consistent use of the supports listed on his IEP is what would be needed....
- She would benefit from a ball chair. It is on her IEP and her special ed teacher says she is/will be ordering them. Right now they have given her a wedge, but her regular classroom teacher doesn't want her to wiggle on it so that defeats its purpose. She could use a para to help her pay attention and stay focused during some parts of regular classroom time. This question would be better answered by her regular classroom teacher, I think sometimes our daughter stresses her regular classroom teacher and only her teacher could really say why
- Smaller teacher to child ratios and more manipulative
- She goes to the Boys and Girls club
- Yes because he loses more things that they are doing in class
- Smaller teacher to child ratios
- Computer with touch screen or is verbal with my child

9. Does your child receive Extended School Year (ESY) services?

9a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services?

- He may
- No
- Yes, I asked for summer school this last summer- but was informed by school secretary - no summer school for elementary students. I asked for guidance for information for a tutor- no response from the school. I was told at one of our first unofficial meetings at the beginning of the school someone contacted my child to see if he wanted to join a reading group. He never told me and he told them no

9b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child?

- Yes, I've not had ESY explained to me
- Yes, they go above and beyond to help my son-they are great

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

- My child's school is great about letting me know what he needs or doesn't need. All my children have had an IEP for the same reason and they have always been great about getting me involved and letting me know what is happening
- I think our school is very lucky to have [REDACTED]. I think she really could use more help from either more Para's or more parent volunteers. Overall for the last 4 years that our son has been one of her students and we could not have asked for a better educational experience for our son.
- I would really like to see a work study program in place for high school special education students so these individuals can obtain work experience that can be included on future employment applications. I would like information on whom to contact to advocate for more state funding in order to place our young adults into group homes and assisted living facilities. My child has expressed a strong desire to live with people his own age instead of with me
- Director of special education does not allow for parents to be a part of the special education process. It feels like she backs the parents in to a corner and bullies into a decision. She is not friendly or capable of interacting with parents as a team. Very one-sided and it is her way or the highway. Very discouraging
- I would like to see my son receive more Occupational Therapy to deal with his sensory issues. Unfortunately there are only 2 distinct OT's and they are spread very thin. So services are limited. I also believe that there should be training provided to all staff who work with disabled children, i.e. the PE teacher, music teacher, custodians, substitutes, etc.
- No (x 3 responses)
- It's ridiculous that we have half-days
- Questions 1-9 apply to Highland Hills School and questions 10-15 apply to the 6th grade Middle school. [REDACTED] s doing better at the middle school in the 6th grade in [REDACTED] Class than she did the 5 years at Highland Hills with [REDACTED]
- Questions 1-14 are for middle school; CCSD#1 does an excellent job from birth to 8th grade- after that it's needing help. In Rawlins High School the special education department needs help the way teachers work with kids in the regular classes is terrible. They don't even want them in classes although they give nice enough excuses. If you do force it so your child gets in their class they have a rough time. In Rawlins after High School there is nothing for them. No services like the ARC or similar place where they can go and live in their eyes on their own without their parents to move on with their lives
- Just don't think there is enough time in the day
- I have two children in special ed classes. And, I was in specialized ed segregated from general ed class back in the 60's. I think in the classroom is great
- The 1/2 days are not a good idea
- Overall, I am pleased with her regular Edu classroom. I am not happy with the special education services
- I currently made an organizer for my child based off the moose organizer book. It's been approximately a month now and I definitely don't have the results with it I was hoping for. I was hoping for communication with the educators didn't happen, knowledge of what was going on in the classroom didn't happen. Very disappointed in a lot of things. My child is definitely not where he needs to be at the time of the 2nd 1/2 of the 4th grade. I am out of any more thoughts to help him. I am open to any help and guidance I can get

Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
 Parent Survey Results
 Carbon County School District #1

Percent of parent respondents who said their child is:

Ethnicity	N	%
Hispanic	5	15%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	6%
White	26	78%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Cognitive Disability	3	9%
Emotional Disability	3	9%
Specific Learning Disability	12	36%
Speech/Language Impairment	10	30%
Other Health Impairment	3	9%
Hearing Impaired (including Deafness)	2	6%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten	3	9%
Grades 1-6	21	63%
Grades 7-8	7	21%
Grades 9-12	2	6%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	25	75%
Resource Room	7	21%
Separate Classroom	1	3%