



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

JOHNSON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1

November 16 – 19, 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

Johnson County School District #1
School Year: 2009 – 2010
Date of On-Site Review: November 16 – 20, 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 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.

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); reverse scored (percentage of non-dropouts is included in the formula)
- Indicator 3 C: 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

Johnson County School District #1 (JCSD #1) is considered a medium school district and reported a special education population of 206 students on its 2009 WDE-427 report. Thus, the district's 2008 – 2009 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 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	JCSD #1 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding JCSD #1
Ind. 2: Combined Dropout Rate	4.95%	9.23%
Ind. 3C: 3 rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	11.11%	29.55%
Ind. 3C: 8 th Gr. Math Proficiency	10.00%	26.49%
Ind. 5: Combined SC and SF rates	4.23%	10.68%

In terms of the variables that are included in the weighted formula, JCSD #1's data compared quite favorably to other medium districts and to the state on the Indicator 2 and Indicator 5 variables. In fact, Johnson #1 boasted the lowest percentage of students in Separate Classroom and Separate Facility placements of all similar-sized districts. However, the Indicator 3 variables negatively affected the district's total score. Johnson #1 had the lowest proficiency rates on the 3rd grade PAWS reading test and the 8th grade PAWS math test of any district in the medium population group. In the end, when these proficiency rates were combined with the 3-year dropout rate and placement data and compared to other districts in the same population group, JCSD #1's score was one of the two lowest of eligible districts, it was selected for an on-site monitoring visit.

It should be noted that the district's performance on these 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 Johnson County School District #1

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed the district's most recent 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 three areas: 1) FAPE – Assistive Technology; 2) FAPE – Extended School Year; and 3) FAPE – Educational Benefit.

1. **FAPE – Assistive Technology** This hypothesis was based on district-reported data showing a comparatively low number of students receiving Assistive Technology services in Johnson #1.
2. **FAPE – Extended School Year** This hypothesis was based on the district's comparatively low percentage of students receiving Extended School Year services.
3. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was formulated due to the district's PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities.

Details regarding the development of each hypothesis 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 three 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 Johnson #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 – Assistive Technology

A. Citation

§300.5 Assistive technology device

Assistive Technology Device *means any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to*

increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, or the replacement of such a device.

§300.6 Assistive Technology Service

Assistive technology service means any service that directly assists a child with a disability in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device. The term includes—

- (a) The evaluation of the needs of a child with a disability, including a functional evaluation of the child in the child's customary environment;*
- (b) Purchasing, leasing, or otherwise providing for the acquisition of assistive technology devices by children with disabilities;*
- (c) Selecting, designing, fitting, customizing, adapting, applying, maintaining, repairing, or replacing assistive technology devices;*
- (d) Coordinating and using other therapies, interventions, or services with assistive technology devices, such as those associated with existing education and rehabilitation plans and programs;*
- (e) Training or technical assistance for a child with a disability or, if appropriate, that child's family; and*
- (f) Training or technical assistance for professionals (including individuals providing education or rehabilitative services), employers, or other individuals who provide services to, employ, or are otherwise substantially involved in the major life functions of that child.*

§300.105 Assistive technology

(a) Each public agency must ensure that assistive technology devices or assistive technology services, or both, as those terms are defined in §§300.5 and 300.6 respectively, are made available to a child with a disability if required as a part of the child's—

- (1) Special education under §300.36*
- (2) Related services under §300.34; or*
- (3) Supplementary aids and services under §§300.38 and 300.114(a)(2)(ii)*

(b) On a case-by-case basis, the use of school-purchased assistive technology devices in a child's home or in other settings is required if the child's IEP Team determines that the child needs access to those services in order to receive FAPE.

B. Evidence

1. Data

According to the July 2009 WDE-427 report submitted by the district, only 1.68 % of students with disabilities in JCSD #1 received Assistive Technology (AT) as a related service over the course of the 2008 – 2009 school year. This number is notable when compared to the overall percentage of students receiving AT in the state's 47 other districts, which stood at approximately 5% during the same period.

2. File Review

WDE staff created a purposeful sample of students more likely than others to need AT in order to receive FAPE. This sample was composed of twelve students who were not receiving Assistive Technology according to the most recent WDE-425 and WDE-427 data. All of these students were reportedly eligible for special education under one or more of the following disability criteria: Autism (AT), Traumatic Brain Injury (BI),

Cognitive Disability (CD), Hearing Impairment (HI), Multiple Disabilities (MU), Orthopedic Impairment (OI), or Visual Impairment (VI). The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might be likely to need Assistive Technology devices or services in order to receive FAPE.

Once on-site in Buffalo, the WDE reviewed these twelve students' special education files. Through the file review process, ten files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Five students appeared to be receiving an appropriate amount and/or type of AT services.
- Two student files did not demonstrate any clear need for Assistive Technology devices or services.
- Two students recently moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student had returned to regular education programming.

For the two remaining students, however, the following characteristics kept them in the sample for further exploration:

- 1 of the 2 files contained evaluation comments indicating the student could benefit from Assistive Technology.
- 1 of 2 files lacked a current evaluation, making it difficult for the WDE to determine whether or not the student's potential need for AT had been meaningfully considered.
- 1 of the 2 files did not contain any evidence that AT was considered at the IEP meeting.
- 1 of 2 files contained an annual goal that appeared to involve Assistive Technology, yet the goal was unclear and not measurable.
- 1 of the 2 files had IEP notes or minutes that reflected team member concerns about needs which could be addressed through AT.

3. Interviews

At the conclusion of the file review, WDE staff interviewed Johnson #1 special education staff, general education staff, district administrators, and related service providers regarding these two students' educational needs and their use of Assistive Technology. Both students were removed from the subsample when the WDE learned that one student was in fact receiving an appropriate amount/type of AT services, and, regarding the second student, district staff provided compelling evidence that this particular student was not in need of AT devices or services.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find JCSD #1 noncompliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – Assistive Technology was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district will not be required to address this finding through the development and implementation of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

D. Recommendation

The WDE recommends that Johnson #1 provide thorough Assistive Technology assessments for students who may need AT. Evaluation reports should be placed in

student's files, and the district must ensure that AT data are reported accurately to the State through the WDE-425 and WDE-427 submissions.

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-427 data collection, 5.46% of the students with disabilities in JCSD #1 received Extended School Year (ESY) services during the 2008 – 2009 school year. The WDE found this data noteworthy, especially when compared to the percentage of students with disabilities receiving ESY in Wyoming as a whole, which stood at approximately 9% during the same period.

2. File Review

The WDE created a purposeful sample of 34 students in Johnson #1 who did not receive ESY during the 2008 – 2009 school year. The sample was composed of two distinct student groups: 1) students eligible for special education under one of the following disability categories: Autism (AT), Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Cognitive Disability (CD), Hearing Impairment (HI), Multiple Disabilities (MU), Orthopedic Impairment (OI), or Visual Impairment (VI); and 2) students who scored 'Basic' or 'Below Basic' on all three PAWS subtests (reading, writing, mathematics) during the 2008 and 2009 administrations. The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might need Extended School Year services in order to receive FAPE.

Once on-site in Buffalo, the WDE reviewed these 34 students' special education files. At the conclusion of the WDE's file review, 25 files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Eleven 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.
- Three students were receiving their education in a home school setting or were parentally placed in a private facility.
- Two students had recently exited special education and returned to regular education programming.
- Two students were in fact receiving Extended School Year services as a component of their current program.

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

- 6 of 9 files described student needs (through the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance) that could potentially be addressed through the provision of Extended School Year services.
- In 5 of 9 files indicated a lack of progress in at least one of the goal areas in each student's current IEP.
- 4 of 5 files indicated a lack of evidence that the IEP team reconvened to address a lack of progress.
- In 3 of the 9 files, the students' levels of progress were unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 4 of the 9 IEPs had goals which had not changed meaningfully from the previous to current IEP.
- 3 of the 9 files clearly documented staff members' concerns about these students' particular educational needs, which could potentially be addressed through ESY.

3. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, the CIPM team interviewed resource room teachers, support staff, general educators, district administrators, and related service providers regarding these nine students' potential need for ESY. Through the interview process, seven additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For five 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.
- 1 student was reportedly receiving services outside of the district during lengthy school breaks.
- 1 student was receiving services from a special educator during regular summer school, which appeared to be adequately meeting the student's needs.

However, while discussing the two remaining students, district staff shared a number of concerns about these students' possible need for ESY. District staff comments included some of the following:

Student Number 1:

- One staff member suggested that ESY during the summer ought to be recommended for this student.

- Another staff member stated ESY was a good idea for this student, saying it would be considered in the spring and that it would be recommended.

Student Number 2:

- This student’s file contained a comment that his/her IEP team would reconvene prior to the end of the grading period in order to determine whether or not ESY was necessary. There was no follow-up documentation in the file that could be used to determine whether or not the team reconvened (and if so, what the outcome of the meeting was).
- During interviews, multiple staff members recommended that ESY be added as a component of this student’s program (despite barriers to his/her potential participation).

C. Finding

The WDE does not find JCSD #1 noncompliant in this area. The State’s compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – Extended School Year was not substantiated as a systemic area of concern through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district is not required to address this finding and correct the noncompliance through the development and implementation of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

However, for the two particular students discussed above, the district must reconvene their respective IEP teams within 45 business days of the date of this report. The students’ WISER ID numbers can be found in the report’s cover letter. The IEP teams must 1) reconsider the students’ need for ESY services, and 2) if necessary, modify the IEP to include appropriate ESY services in accordance with 34 CFR §300.106. The WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the IEP.

Area 3: 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 Johnson #1 were below the overall state targets for both 3rd grade reading and 8th grade mathematics. Probing deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 55 of the district's students with disabilities at any grade level scored below 'Proficient' on all three PAWS subtests (reading, writing, and math). The WDE hypothesized that some of these students may have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

2. File Review

Using these 55 students as its purposeful sample, the WDE reviewed students' special education files as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, 28 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Fifteen students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- Twelve students recently moved or transferred out of district.
- One student had recently exited special education.

This reduction left 27 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:

- 7 of the 27 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.
- 11 out of 27 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 10 of the 27 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- In 11 of the 27 files, the student's levels of progress were unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 4 of the 27 files indicated a clear lack of progress, and for two of those files, there was no evidence that the IEP team reconvened to address this lack of progress.
- 8 of the IEPs had goals which had not changed meaningfully from the previous IEP.
- 8 out of 27 files contained a program of special education and related services that did not appear to address the student's needs and goals adequately.
- 4 out of 27 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.

- 8 of the 27 files indicated that the students were receiving a 'D' or an 'F' in at least one core academic class (mathematics, language arts, science, or social studies).
- 3 of the 27 IEPs had notes that reflected a concern which did not appear to be addressed in the IEP.
- 8 students' cumulative files contained records showing students to have experienced frequent or long absences from school.
- 3 students' cumulative records included documentation of discipline and/or behavior issues that appeared to be unaddressed in the corresponding special education files.

3. Interviews

Following the file review, the WDE monitoring team interviewed district special education staff, general education teachers, district administrators, and related service providers regarding these 27 specific students. Through the interview process, 17 additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding eleven students, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were in fact making progress and receiving educational benefit.
- For three 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.
- For three students who appeared to be lacking goals in one or more areas of need, district staff were able to explain how certain IEP goals did in fact address these students' needs. Furthermore, each of these students was shown to be making adequate/expected progress.

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

- Regarding a student who was not passing multiple classes, a staff member reported that reading instruction would be beneficial, although these services not included in the current IEP.
- When discussing a student's struggles in a general education class, a staff member noted that specialized instruction in language arts was a possible means of improving the student's learning. The staff member added, "I don't think there is anything else we can do."
- Regarding a particular student's significant difficulties in the general education language arts class, a staff member stated, "[Student name] struggles with reading," but added that the team wanted to "give [student] a chance" before reconvening the team or amending the student's program.
- One staff member expressed confusion over whether or not a particular student with a disability could be allowed to participate in general education interventions, asking, "Can I offer reading supports even if not on the IEP?"
- Regarding one student whose inappropriate behavior is a documented concern, a staff member stated that the behavior is not being addressed through the IEP or in a behavior plan, adding, "We just talk about [student name]."

- A district staff member commented that a certain student's poor progress might be due to the fact that the student lost his/her glasses during the previous school year, and they had not yet been replaced. The team had not reconvened to address the lack of progress and was reportedly waiting for the student's parent to act.
- When discussing a particular student's possible need for a behavior intervention plan, a general education teacher commented, "That would be a good idea to address in the IEP."
- While discussing a student who was struggling academically, a staff member commented, "We don't like to see kids struggle, but we like to see what they can do before we move them." The team had not reconvened to consider a change of placement or any other adjustment to the student's program.
- When discussing one of a student's potentially unaddressed educational needs, a staff member remarked, "[Student name] has more needs than we can work on!"
- In describing one student's lack of expected progress, a staff member commented, "This kid needs daily instruction, and being on the block schedule is very difficult. If we have a holiday thrown in, this student could miss many days of instruction, and we have to start from scratch."
- Another staff member mentioned that a student's poor progress might be due to scheduling difficulties: "Kids can go without services for as much as five or six days at a time with holidays. These kids need daily supports to show progress."

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in JCSD #1 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).

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, 48 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 Johnson #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 179 surveys, and 34 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (19%). In Appendix B of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

File Review 1001000	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))	49	95.92%
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))	49	89.80%
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))	49	95.92%
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))	49	87.76%
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.	49	93.88%
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))	49	95.92%
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))	49	83.67%
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))	49	65.31%
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	49	85.71%
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))	49	95.92%
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))	49	100.00%

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))	49	93.88%
E47. The file contains prior written notice regarding the implementation of the current IEP. (§300.503)	49	89.80%
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))	49	91.84%
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))	49	97.96%
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))	49	95.92%

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

Total Respondents: 34
Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 179
Returned due to invalid address: 10
Response Rate: 19.0%

	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.	0%	0%	12%	21%	24%	44%	89%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	0%	0%	0%	15%	18%	68%	101%
3. My child's educational needs are being adequately addressed by the school.	0%	0%	3%	9%	21%	68%	98%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	0%	0%	6%	12%	21%	62%	95%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.	0%	0%	3%	18%	24%	56%	98%

6. Does your child use assistive technology (AT) devices at school? Note: assistive technology devices are items/equipment used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. 6a. If no, do you think he/she would make more progress if he/she used these devices at school? 6b. If yes, are the amount /type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 18%	No 65%	Don't Know 18%
7. Does your child receive Extended School Year (EY) services? 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? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 24%	No 68%	Don't Know 9%
8. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her academic needs and improve your child's progress in school? 8a. If yes, what could the school be doing? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 6%	No 82%	Don't Know 12%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Agree, Strongly Agree, Very Strongly Agree	State results (% who agreed)
9. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	6%	0%	12%	35%	24%	24%	83%	54%
10. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.	0%	0%	3%	15%	26%	56%	97%	93%
11. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	0%	0%	6%	12%	24%	59%	95%	90%
12. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	0%	0%	9%	12%	32%	47%	91%	81%
13. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	0%	0%	10%	16%	29%	45%	90%	76%

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

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

6. Does your child use assistive technology (AT) devices at school? Note: assistive technology devices are items/equipment used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability.

6a. If no, do you think he/she would make more progress if he/she used these devices at school?

- Don't know
- No

6b. If yes, are the amount/type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child?

- I would like to see some sort of voice to type computer similar to the one at the high school so it will be familiar to them as they progress
- Yes, for now they seem fine

7. Does your child receive extended school year (ESY) services?

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

- He is so far behind I think it would do him some good
- Don't know
- He is so far behind I think it would help him
- No
- No, we are still in the school year
- Yes

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

- [REDACTED] and her staff do a fantastic job

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

8a. If yes, what could the school be doing?

- At the beginning of the year the case worker told me that I would be receiving regular updates. I felt that I was a bit placated, and have not received updates unless I request them. I do believe that is it my role to ask questions and support my child and contact the teachers with questions, but I do believe that the teachers should contact parents regularly as well
- My child had done better than ever
- Great job
- They do a great job

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

- I felt that both the speech teacher and the classroom teachers understand my child. I told both the principal and the speech teacher that I wanted to make sure that the teacher felt her concerns were being addressed and supported
- I love the program, my child is in here, and she has had so much progress this year

- I was very pleased with the school psychologist at Johnson County School district
- [REDACTED] and staff have taken my son from c's and d's to a's and b's. They care and make kids feel they can do well when they teach them how to do well. If it were up to me they would go with my child through college however, because of them I don't think he will need them
- Satisfied with the services
- [REDACTED] at Clear Creek Elementary school in Buffalo Wyoming is absolutely wonderful!!! My son loves her as we do
- When talking about options for my child, the teachers spoke about programs using anagrams. It was like they were speaking another language and it was very confusing
- Great program, thank you
- Haven't disagreed
- No
- Thank you

Respondent Demographics
Johnson County School District #1

Ethnicity	N	%
White	26	100%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Autism	1	4%
Developmental Delay	1	4%
Emotional Disability	2	8%
Specific Learning Disability	13	50%
Speech/Language Impairment	5	19%
Other Health Impairment	3	12%
Multiple Disabilities	1	4%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten	0	0%
Grades 1-6	16	62%
Grades 7-8	3	12%
Grades 9-12	7	27%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	15	58%
Resource Room	10	38%
Separate Classroom	1	4%