



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

LARAMIE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1

March 9 – 13, 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

Laramie County School District #1
School Year: 2008 – 2009
Date of On-Site Review: March 9 – 13, 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 Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Group¹ worked with the WDE Special Programs Unit to set the priority indicators and weighted scoring system to be used in determining which districts would be selected for on-site monitoring. IDEA 2004 places a strong emphasis on positive educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities ages three through 21. This factor greatly influenced the selection of two key indicators of student performance from the State's Performance Plan as priorities for the focused monitoring process. The ultimate goal of focused monitoring is to promote systems change which will positively influence educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

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

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

B. Individual District Selection

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

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

Laramie County School District #1 (LCSD #1) is considered a large school district and reported a special education population of 1,621 students on its 2007 WDE-425 report. Thus, the district's 2007 – 2008 data was ranked against data from all other large districts for the same time period. The two lowest performers in each population group were selected for an on-site monitoring visit using the comparison to state rates found below. Districts who received on-site monitoring visits during the 2007 – 2008 school year were excluded from consideration for monitoring this year in order to give them adequate time to implement their Corrective Action Plans:

SPP Indicators	LCSD #1 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding LCSD #1
#3C Secondary Reading Proficiency	31.12%	27.66%
#3C Secondary Math Proficiency	42.41%	32.96%

In terms of the variables that are included in the weighted formula, LCSD #1 scored approximately four percentage points higher than the state rate for secondary reading proficiency. In addition, the district's secondary mathematics proficiency rate for students with disabilities was nearly ten percentage points higher than the comparable state rate. When compared to other large districts, Laramie #1's math proficiency rate was higher than six other districts in this population group. However, when compared to the other large districts, the district's reading proficiency rate for secondary students was higher than only five districts' comparable rates. In the end, when these proficiency rates were combined and compared to other large districts, LCSD #1's score was one of the two lowest of eligible districts, and the WDE selected Laramie #1 for an on-site monitoring visit.

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

Focused Monitoring Conditions for Laramie County School District #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 five areas: 1) FAPE – Assistive Technology; 2) FAPE – Extended School Year; 3) Extended School Year – Unilateral Limits; 4) Least Restrictive Environment; and 5) FAPE – Educational Benefit.

1. **FAPE – Assistive Technology** This hypothesis was based on the district’s low percentage of students receiving Assistive Technology services.
2. **FAPE – Extended School Year** This hypothesis was based on the district’s comparatively low percentage of students receiving Extended School Year services.
3. **Extended School Year – Unilateral Limits** This hypothesis was formulated due to lingering ESY questions from the WDE’s previous monitoring visit in the district.
4. **Least Restrictive Environment** This hypothesis was founded on the district’s comparatively high percentage of students placed in “Resource Room” or “Self-Contained” placements.
5. **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 five hypotheses chosen for on-site focused monitoring, the WDE also monitored other areas for IDEA compliance through a procedural compliance review of each file reviewed during testing of the aforementioned hypotheses. Results of the review are included with this report in Appendix A. Appendix B contains the results of a parent survey that was conducted in the district during a four-week window that included the dates of the on-site monitoring visit.

Results of On-Site Monitoring for Laramie #1

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

Area 1: FAPE – 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 combined December 2007 and June 2008 SEEDS collections, none of the over 1,600 students with disabilities in LCSD #1 received Assistive Technology (AT) as a related service. 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 3% 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 29 students who 1) were not receiving Assistive Technology according to WDE-425 and WDE-427 data, 2) had an Autism (AT), Cognitive Disability (CD), or Multiple Disabilities (MU) disability label, and 3) scored below 'Proficient' on at least one of the PAWS-ALT subtests. The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might need Assistive Technology devices or services in order to receive FAPE.

Once on-site in Cheyenne, the WDE reviewed these 29 students' special education files. Through the file review process, 26 files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Sixteen students were receiving an appropriate amount and/or type of AT services.
- Six students' files did not indicate an apparent need for Assistive Technology.
- Four students recently transferred out of the district.

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

- 3 of the 3 IEP files indicated that the student was not currently receiving Assistive Technology services or using AT devices.
- 2 of 3 files contained comments indicating that the student's communication needs might potentially be addressed with Assistive Technology, either in the student's evaluation reports or in the Present Levels of Performance section of the IEP.
- 1 of the 3 files contained comments indicating that the student's gross/fine motor needs might potentially be addressed through the use of Assistive Technology.
- For 2 of the 3 students, levels of progress were unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.

3. Interviews

At the conclusion of the file review, WDE staff interviewed Laramie #1 special education staff and related service providers regarding these three students' educational needs and their use of Assistive Technology. Ultimately, all three students were removed from the subsample for the following reasons:

- 2 of the 3 were removed from the subsample when the WDE learned that these students were in fact receiving some type of AT services.
- 1 of the 3 students was removed from the subsample during the interview process when district staff provided compelling reasons why he/she was not in need of AT devices or services.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find LCSD #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 the Laramie #1 provide thorough Assistive Technology assessments for students who may need AT. Evaluation reports should be placed in student files, and AT data must be 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 combined December 2007 WDE-425 and July 2008 WDE-427 data collections, 130 students in LCSD #1 received Extended School Year (ESY) services. These 130 students represented 6.18% of the district's students with disabilities. This reported data is noteworthy in that it is below overall rate of students with disabilities receiving ESY in Wyoming, which stood at approximately 6.8% during the same period. The WDE hypothesized that some Laramie #1 students who were reportedly not receiving ESY might be in need of these services in order to receive FAPE.

2. File Review

The WDE created a purposeful sample of 30 students in Laramie #1 who did not receive ESY during the 2007-2008 school year. The sample was composed of students who were eligible for special education under one of the following disability categories: Autism (AT), Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Cognitive Disability (CD), Emotional Disability (ED), or Hearing Impairment (HI). None of these 30 students scored proficient or above on any 2008 PAWS subtest (reading, writing, mathematics). Furthermore, all of the students in this sample were enrolled in grades seven through twelve and placed in Self-Contained (SC), Resource Room (RR), Separate Facility (SF), or Homebound (HH) placements.

Once on-site in Cheyenne, the WDE reviewed these 30 students' special education files. At the conclusion of the WDE's file review, 21 files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- 21 student files contained IEPs that appeared reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit without the provision of ESY services.

- 8 students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- 1 student dropped out of school.
- 1 student's file indicated that he/she was to receive ESY services under his/her current IEP.

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

- 7 of 9 files contained an IEP in which the ESY option was checked 'no' with little or no further explanation.
- 1 of the 9 files did not contain evidence that ESY was considered in the current IEP: neither 'yes' nor 'no' was selected.
- 3 of 9 files indicated a lack of adequate or expected progress toward at least one of the student's IEP goals. Only 2 of these 3 files contained evidence that the IEP teams reconvened to address the students' lack of progress.
- In 1 of the 9 files, the student's level of progress in at least one goal area was unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 1 of the 9 files contained a current IEP that was too new (developed too recently) for progress to be reported; the WDE was curious about this student's levels of progress and whether or not he/she might need ESY.
- 1 of the 9 students was found to be failing more than one core academic class.

3. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, WDE team members interviewed resource room teachers, support staff, and related service providers regarding these nine students' potential need for ESY. Through the interview process, four additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons when district staff presented compelling evidence that these students were making adequate progress and were not in need of ESY in order to receive FAPE.

However, for the five remaining students, the following interview details support the State's hypothesis that some LCSD #1 students who are not receiving ESY may actually need these services in order to receive FAPE:

- One staff member reported that a certain student would benefit from ESY in order to maintain progress made toward his/her behavior goals. However, the staff member added that ESY was not offered due to the fact that the student was not likely to attend.
- Regarding a student whose psychological evaluation report recommended that the IEP team consider Extended School Year services, a related service provider agreed that the student would benefit from ESY. The provider mentioned that the student has trouble retaining information over time and was not sure why these services were not included in the student's program.
- A related service provider stated that one particular student would benefit from continued work on social skills goals outside of the regular school year.
- A special educator stated that one student in the sample needed ESY so that he/she could capitalize on a recent breakthrough in the use of a switch. Although this teacher stated that ESY could be added to the student's program through an amendment, these services had not yet been added to the IEP (the teacher

mentioned that he/she was waiting for ESY schedule information from the district—see Area 3 below).

- Another special educator mentioned that one particular student's slow progress was due (in part) to the student's difficulty in retaining knowledge. The teacher stated, "One day [student's name] knows her times tables, and one day [he/she] doesn't." The teacher believed that the student would "probably" benefit from ESY, but it had not been discussed.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in LCSD #1 are not always provided in accordance with the ESY requirements established in §300.106. 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 3: Extended School Year – Unilateral Limits

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

In its 2006 visit to Laramie #1, the WDE made a finding of noncompliance in the area of ESY under its previous monitoring system. Although the finding was eventually cleared in the fall of 2008, the WDE expressed continuing ESY concerns in a letter to the district (dated October 1, 2008). In the letter, the State Director of Special Education stated, "The State will revisit the district's provision of ESY in order to ensure that there are no unilateral limits on type, amount, or duration of these services."

As discussed under Area 2 above, Laramie #1 reported that 130 students received ESY services during the 2007-2008 school year. Based upon data gathered during the

process of clearing the district's ESY finding from 2006, the WDE hypothesized that some Laramie #1 students who received ESY during the 2007 – 2008 school year might also be receiving ESY during the current school year. Of the students whose current IEPs indicated a need for ESY services, the WDE sought to determine whether or not those services have been limited by type, amount, and/or duration despite the students' own individual needs.

2. File Review

The WDE created a purposeful sample of 53 students in Laramie #1 who reportedly received ESY during the 2007-2008 school year. The sample was composed of two separate groups of students: one group consisted of 25 students with "high incidence" primary disability labels of Learning Disability (LD) and Speech Language Disability (SL). The second group consisted of 28 students with "low incidence" disability labels of Autism (AT), Cognitive Disability (CD), Emotional Disability (ED), Multiple Disabilities (MU) or Visual Impairment (VI). Furthermore, all of the students in the second group were placed in Self-Contained (SC) settings.

Once on-site in Cheyenne, the WDE reviewed these 53 students' special education files. At the conclusion of the WDE's file review, 35 files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- 27 student files indicated that the student was no longer receiving ESY services under the current IEP.
- 5 students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- 1 student dropped out of school.
- 1 student exited special education after being found no longer eligible for services.
- 1 student will exit special education at the end of this school year due to the fact that he/she recently turned 21 years of age.

For the remaining eighteen student files, one or more of the following characteristics kept them in the sample:

- 15 of the 18 files indicated that the student would again receive ESY in 2009.
- 13 of 18 files contained a statement indicating that the team would meet at a later date to determine each student's ESY services.
- 2 of 18 files did not contain evidence that ESY was considered in the current IEP: neither 'yes' nor 'no' was selected.
- 5 of the 18 students had IEPs that will expire this spring. The WDE was interested in learning from staff whether or not ESY would be recommended again for these students, and if so, what district staff would recommend in terms of type, amount, and duration of these services.

3. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, the WDE team interviewed resource room teachers, support staff, and related service providers regarding these eighteen students' potential need for ESY. Through the interview process, four additional students were removed from the sample when the WDE learned that these students' IEP teams did not recommend ESY services for 2009.

When discussing the remaining fourteen students, however, staff members made several troubling comments that seem to indicate continued unilateral limitations on the amount and duration of ESY services offered in Laramie #1:

- When asked about the schedule for summer ESY services, a related service provider stated that it was “up in the air” at the time of the interview. This provider explained that the dates for ESY are usually established through an e-mail from district administration rather than through the IEP team process.
- A special education teacher reported that, “The district sets the dates—the special ed office. It’s usually right after school is out and ends before Frontier Days.” When asked what would be done for a student who needed services to continue beyond those established dates, the teacher stated that he/she was not sure how such a situation would be handled.
- A related service provider reported that the summer ESY duration was likely to be “Five weeks for three-and-a-half days or six weeks for four-and-a-half days.”
- An educator expressed concern that some students might need services in the summer beyond what has typically been provided. He/she added, “But it can be hard to find the people.”
- A special educator mentioned that summer ESY services are likely to end in late July because, in his/her words, “Everything in Cheyenne revolves around Frontier Days. Everything.”
- For one particular student, a therapist recommended daily stretching and weekly direct services in order to maintain the student’s flexibility and range of motion. When asked who would provide those services beyond the duration of the district’s summer ESY schedule, the therapist stated that students might be able to arrange services at the home through other agencies.
- A special education teacher mentioned that “Some kids may need to go beyond the end of July. They lose things in August.”
- A teacher reported that he/she was recommending the “full duration” of ESY for a particular student. When asked if that student would benefit from services beyond the typical “window,” the teacher stated, “[Student’s name] would benefit, but I don’t think we have actual services then.”
- A teacher stated that it might be beneficial to offer services in August but added, “The district administration sets the schedule for ESY.”

C. Finding

Given the fact that specific ESY services have not yet been established for these fourteen students, the WDE declines to make a finding of noncompliance under 34 CFR §300.106 at this time. It appears that ESY services are not limited by type, as staff comments indicate that a wide variety of services are offered to meet student needs beyond the regular school year. However, in order to alleviate the Department’s concern over the comments listed above, the district is hereby required to provide the following information to the WDE no later than May 31, 2009:

- WISER ID numbers of students scheduled to receive ESY this summer
- Type of services to be provided to each student during ESY (i.e., physical therapy, mathematics, language, etc.)
- Amount of ESY services to be provided for each (minutes per week)
- Duration of ESY services to be provided for each (weeks of service beyond the regular school year)

Through the receipt and analysis of this additional information, the WDE seeks to ensure that ESY services are not limited to certain blocks of time within a certain set of weeks, regardless of student needs. If the district fails to provide this information by the date requested, or if the information supplied indicates unilateral limits on amount and duration of ESY regardless of student needs, the WDE will then make a finding of noncompliance in this area.

D. Recommendation

The WDE recommends that the district collect ESY information and recommendations from IEP teams throughout the regular school year, and then create an Extended School Year schedule based on the reported student needs (rather than setting a schedule and asking IEP teams and students to conform to the district's schedule). Related service providers should also be consulted when IEP teams are making ESY determinations and plans. Ultimately, it is imperative that ESY services, like any other special education or related service, be driven by *student needs* rather than external factors.

Area 4: Least Restrictive Environment

A. Citation

§300.114 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

(a) General. (2) Each public agency must ensure that –

(i) To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are nondisabled; and

(ii) Special classes, separate schooling or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disabilities is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

§300.115 Continuum of alternative placements.

(a) Each public agency must ensure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services.

(b) The continuum required in paragraph (a) of this section must –

(1) Include the alternative placements listed in the definition of special education under § 300.38 (instruction in regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions); and

(2) Make provision for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement.

§300.116 Placements.

In determining the educational placement of a child with a disability, including a preschool child with a disability, each public agency must ensure that –

(a) The placement decision-

(1) Is made by a group of persons, including the parents, and other persons knowledgeable about the child, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options; and

(2) Is made in conformity with the LRE provision of this subpart, including §§300.114 through 300.118;

(b) The child's placement –

(1) Is determined at least annually;

- (2) Is based on the child's IEP; and
- (3) Is as close as possible to the child's home;
- (c) Unless the IEP of a child with a disability requires some other arrangement; the child is educated in the school that he or she would attend if nondisabled;
- (d) In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs; and
- (e) A child with a disability is not removed from education in age-appropriate regular classrooms solely because of needed modifications in the general education curriculum.

§300.117 Nonacademic settings.
 In providing or arranging for the provision of nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities, including meals, recess periods, and the services and activities set forth in §300.107, each public agency must ensure that each child with a disability participates with nondisabled children in the extracurricular services and activities to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of that child. The public agency must ensure that each child with a disability has supplementary aids and services determined by the child's IEP Team to be appropriate and necessary for the child to participate in nonacademic settings.

B. Evidence

1. Data

As previously noted in this report's introduction, the WDE team noticed that Laramie #1 appeared to have a comparatively high percentage of its students with disabilities placed in "Self-Contained" or "SC" settings (spending more than 60% of their time in non-general education environments). According to the combined December 2007 WDE-425 and July 2008 WDE-427 reports, the district's percentage of students in SC placements was 11.04%, which was roughly 3% higher than the state's overall rate of 8.33%.

In addition, data from Laramie #1 also indicated a higher percentage of students in "Resource Room" or "RR" settings (spending 21% to 60% of their time in non-general education environments). According to the same reports referenced above, the district's percentage of students in RR placements was approximately 35%; the comparable state rate was 29%. The WDE hypothesized that there may be some students in RR or SC placements who could be successfully served in less restrictive settings with the use of appropriate supports & services.

2. File Review

In preparation for the on-site visit, the WDE created a purposeful sample of certain Laramie #1 students in Resource Room settings and Self-Contained settings. All of the students were in grades seven through 12, and all of them scored 'Proficient' or 'Advanced' on all three 2008 PAWS subtests. All of the sample's 37 students in SC settings were identified as having an Emotional Disability (ED), a Learning Disability (LD), or an Other Health Impairment (HL); the ten students in RR settings carried a variety of disability labels. Given these parameters, the total number of students in the State's LRE sample came to 47 students. The WDE hypothesized that some of these LCSD #1 students might be successfully educated in a less restrictive environment if provided with appropriate supplementary aids and services.

Once on-site in Cheyenne, WDE staff reviewed these 47 students' special education files. Through the file review process, 38 of the 47 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Seventeen students had recently moved or transferred out of the district.
- Seven students' placements appeared to be appropriate (given the IEP teams' justifications in the file).
- Five students were moved to a less restrictive environment under their current IEP and were spending larger amounts of time in general education classrooms.
- Three students dropped out of school.
- Three students graduated in 2008.
- Two students exited special education after being found no longer eligible for services.
- One student's restrictive placement was the result of a court order.

Nine files remained in the core sample following the file review, and one or more of the following characteristics kept them in the subsample:

- 9 of the 9 files contained no evidence that the IEP teams had considered a less restrictive environment for the students in question.
- 3 out of 9 files contained similar or identical placement justifications in the LRE section of the IEP (usually referring to students' need for special education support for academic success).
- For 5 of the 9 students, challenging behavior appeared to have been a factor in the placement decision. Of these 5 student files, 1 did not contain a functional behavior assessment (FBA), although 4 of the 5 contained a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP).
- 2 of the 9 student files described a lack of progress on one or more of the students' IEP goals.
- For 2 of the 9 students, the WDE could not determine their levels of progress in the current setting due to unclear progress reports.

3. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, special education teachers, support staff, and related service providers were interviewed by WDE team members regarding the learning environments for these nine students. At the conclusion of the interview process, all nine students were removed from the LRE sample for the following reasons:

- For eight students, staff provided compelling reasons why the IEPs could not be implemented in less restrictive environments even with the provision of supplementary aids and services. These students' placements appeared to be appropriate in light of the information offered by district staff.
- One student dropped out of school.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find Laramie #1 noncompliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to LRE was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district is not required to address this area in its Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

D. Recommendation

The WDE recommends that the district take steps to ensure that each IEP for a student who is receiving services outside of the general education environment includes an

explanation of the reasons why a less restrictive environment is not appropriate given the student's individual characteristics and needs. These placement justifications should be individualized and include reasons why the student can not be educated in general education environments even with the use of supplementary aids and services. Furthermore, the WDE recommends that LCSD #1 IEP teams document interventions and other placement options that have been attempted and/or considered prior to the teams decision to deliver services outside of the general education environment.

Area 5: 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

In reviewing district data, the WDE noted that 2008 PAWS proficiency rates among students with disabilities in Laramie #1 were below the overall state targets for language arts at both the middle and high school levels. For mathematics, the district's proficiency rate was below the state target at the high school level but exceeded the state target at the middle school level. Probing deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 485 of the district's students with disabilities at any grade level scored below 'Proficient' on all three PAWS subtests (reading, writing, and math). Of these 485, 166 students scored 'Below Basic' on all of these subtests. 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 a stratified random sample of 60 students taken from the group of 166 described above, the WDE reviewed special education files as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, 26 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Nineteen students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- Four students recently moved or transferred out of district.
- Two students graduated in the spring of 2008.
- One student dropped out of school.

This reduction left 34 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:

- 19 of the 34 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.
- 18 out of 34 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 18 of the 34 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- 12 of the 34 files indicated a lack of adequate or expected progress toward at least one of the student's IEP goals. Of these 12 files, only 3 contained evidence that the IEP team reconvened (or amended the program) to address the student's lack of progress.
- In 7 of the 34 files, the student's level of progress was unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 10 out of 34 files contained a program of special education and related services that did not appear to adequately address the student's needs and goals. In 1 additional file, the provision of related services was documented, but the type of service was not specified.
- 5 of the 34 students were currently receiving poor grades ('Ds' or 'Fs') in at least one core academic class (math, language arts, science, social studies/history).

3. Interviews

Following the file review, special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers were interviewed regarding these 34 specific students. Through the interview process, nineteen additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding nine students, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were now making progress and receiving educational benefit.
- For five students whose IEPs appeared to be lacking goals in specific areas of need, district staff were able to explain how the students' current goals addressed each identified area of need.

- For four 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 the most recent evaluation.
- For one student whose services appeared inadequate, the WDE learned that the student's needs for specialized instruction are being addressed through collaboration between special education and general education staff. District staff reported that this student is likely to exit special education in the near future.

These reductions left fifteen students remaining in the subsample. The following comments are among those made by district staff members that lend further support for a finding in this area:

- A general education teacher stated that one particular student "is not going to survive in my class. [Student's name] is so far behind." However, the IEP team had not reconvened to address the student's lack of progress.
- One service provider mentioned that a particular student did not need to have a goal in an area in which the student receives services because the services are consultative and not direct.
- Three separate service providers all reported that one student's biggest impediment to progress on his goals was the student's poor attendance. One teacher reported, "[Student's name] is not in class, but [he/she] is in the building." The team has not reconvened to address the student's lack of progress, nor has it addressed attendance in the student's IEP.
- A teacher predicted that a student's poor grades (failing multiple classes) "...will go on like that" for the foreseeable future. However, the IEP team had not reconvened to discuss strategies or changes to the student's program.
- Regarding one student whose IEP needs and goals have changed drastically from the previous year to the current year, a teacher proffered that the adjustments were due to a change in the student's disability label rather than his/her individual needs.
- A student who is already on an IEP was found to be "in the BIT process" in order to determine his/her needs for additional special education services. The student's teacher stated, "We've been talking all year about what [student's name] needs. [He/She] needs more than speech. [Student's name] is beyond what a gen. ed. teacher can give [him/her]." However, the student's deficits in reading, writing, and mathematics were already documented in previous evaluation reports.
- When a teacher was asked why a certain student did not receive specialized reading instruction (which had been recommended in academic assessment reports), the teacher responded, "It's all dictated by scheduling."
- Regarding a student who had no goal in an area of academic need (in which he/she was receiving services), a teacher explained that, "because [student's name] is ED, we don't have to provide academic goals."
- When asked about one student's lack of a goal in the area of study skills (which was listed on the IEP as a special education service), a teacher responded, "I have never written a goal for study skills." When the interviewer asked why study skills goals are not written, the teacher replied, "That's a good question. I'll find the answer to that question."

- A service provider reported that one student with significant social/emotional needs was not making adequate progress in that area. The staff member stated, “I wish [he/she] would be further” at this point in the school year. The provider also mentioned that additional service time would be beneficial for the student: although the IEP listed 30 minutes per week of individual counseling, the district staff member added, “I don’t know how much they followed through with that.”

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in LCSD #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, the WDE reviewed 153 files 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 and conduct additional self assessment to assure full compliance in these areas. More detailed guidance is provided on the CAP form.

B. Parent Survey Results

As part of the monitoring process, the WDE developed a Parent Survey in order to provide all parents an opportunity to give input on their children’s special education experiences in Laramie #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 1,642 surveys, and 215 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (13.5%). In Appendix B of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district’s review.

File Review 1101000	Number of files reviewed	Percent of files compliant
B. Most Recent Evaluation / Reevaluation		
B1. The file contains a current evaluation	153	100.00 %
B2. The file contains documentation that a reevaluation was conducted by the public agency at least once in the past three years .(300.303(b)(2))	153	96.73 %
B5. Prior written notice includes a description of the action the public agency is proposing or refusing. (300.503(b)(1))	153	100.00 %
B17. The initial evaluation/reevaluation includes a variety of assessment tools and strategies that provide relevant information that directly assist persons in determining the educational needs of the child and is administered by qualified evaluators. (300.304(b)(1)), (300.304(b)(2), (300.204(c)(7))	153	98.04 %
B19. As part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the IEP team reviewed current classroom based, local or state assessments. (300.305(a)(1)(ii))	153	* 87.58 %
B22. The file contains documentation that, as part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status and motor abilities. (300.304)(c)(4))	153	99.35 %
C. Eligibility Determination		
C6. In the evaluation/ reevaluation, the file documents whether the child has or continues to have a disability, the present level of academic achievement and related developmental needs of the child, whether the child continues to need special education and related services and whether additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed. (300.305(a)(2))	153	98.69 %
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))	153	99.35 %
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))	153	94.77 %
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))	153	78.43 %
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.	153	94.77 %
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))	153	98.04 %
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))	153	90.20 %

File Review --- Trained reviewers' assesment of files Percent of "Yes" responses on each item	Number of files with a yes/no response	Percent of Yes responses
E27. The IEP includes measurable annual academic, developmental and functional goals designed to meet the needs of the child and enable the child to progress in the general curriculum. (300.320(a)(2)(i)(A)), (300.324(a)(iv))	153	78.43 %
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	153	95.42 %
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))	153	86.27 %
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))	153	99.35 %
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))	153	99.35 %
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))	153	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))	153	99.35 %
G. ESY		
G1. The file contains a parent notice that ESY services will be considered	153	94.77 %

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

Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 1642
Total Respondents: 215
Returned due to invalid address: 61
Response Rate = 13.60%

	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.	10%	4%	17%	33%	17%	19%	69%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	4%	0%	4%	29%	25%	39%	93%
3. My child's educational needs are being adequately addressed by the school.	4%	4%	7%	32%	25%	28%	85%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	4%	2%	10%	33%	24%	26%	82%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.	7%	3%	10%	42%	21%	18%	81%

6. Does your child receive counseling, social work, or psychological services at school? 6a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? See additional pages for responses. 6b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 8%	No 49%	Don't Know 43%
7. 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. 7a. If no, do you think he/she would make more progress if he/she used these devices at school? See additional pages for responses. 7b. If yes, are the amount/type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 15%	No 68%	Don't Know 17%
8. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her educational needs and improve your child's progress in school? 8a. If yes, what could the school be doing? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 15%	No 61%	Don't Know 24%
9. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her educational needs and improve your child's progress in School? 9a. If yes, what could the school be doing? See additional pages for responses.	Yes 29%	No 57%	Don't Know 14%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Agree, Strongly Agree, Very Strongly Agree	State results (% who agreed)
10. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	9%	4%	24%	38%	14%	12%	64%	50%
11. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.	5%	1%	5%	31%	23%	35%	89%	90%
12. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	5%	2%	8%	28%	26%	30%	84%	84%
13. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	9%	2%	11%	27%	28%	24%	79%	76%
14. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	10%	2%	16%	29%	22%	21%	72%	68%

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

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Open-Ended Comments for
Laramie County School District #1**

6. Does your child receive Assistive Technology (AT) services?

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

- By reading the information I do believe my child would benefit from this.
- Depends on what types of services are offered.
- Don't know.
- Don't know what they are.
- Don't know.
- I am not sure what these services include so don't know if it would help my child or not.
- I believe if he had a program that could read to him at times may help.
- I don't know what's available so I don't know if my child would benefit or not.
- I've never heard of it.
- If I understand the meaning of assistive technology, He does not need that in depth of help.
- No.
- No, he is in kindergarten and everything is very hands on at this time.
- No, my child would not make more progress with AT services.
- No, our son's disability is physical, not cognitive.
- No, she is only in the speech program because of her (R's).
- No, there has not been an identified need for AT services.
- No.
- No. He is on an IEP for speech, and he isn't a severe case.
- Not for what he needs no.
- Not sure what they are.
- Not that I know of, I don't know what they are.
- Think note book.
- We had the Solo software for home use and didn't use it. I do think it is a great tool for all classrooms to have available for ALL students.
- We have discussed some technology options that would be good prep for college level prep classes. I do not believe they have yet been implemented.
- YES! The problem is once AT recommends something; the AT team does little to make sure school understands the technology. The AT team does little follow up with child.
- Yes.
- Yes - I think that at some point in the near future, we need to quit worrying about the mechanics of handwriting and start work on using voice recognition software and technology to help him get his thoughts on paper. Any work in this area has been done by his family and not even mentioned by school.
- Yes - using computers to type assignments, look up stuff etc. On the use of an Alpha Smart would be helpful.
- Yes.
- Don't know.

- No.
- No.
- No he is doing great.
- No, my child doesn't need AT services.
- Yes.
- Yes, Kurzweil is a program that reads the text books to the student. I would like to see my student using this program. I have inquired, but it never was set up.
- He definitely needs this service and it is necessary for his education.
- No.
- No, mom and dad do all that.
- Not at this time.

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

- Do not know.
- Don't know.
- I think the FM system works great for him.
- My child has a slight hearing loss and they have amplified his classroom teacher while talking and it has been awesome it helps him understand a lot better and doesn't always need to look at the teacher for direction.
- N/A.
- No there are not enough of these services being used.
- No.
- Not sure.
- She listens to the CD's of a social studies lesson, then takes an oral test on the lesson. I don't know how much of each lesson she comprehends. She just started this service.
- Yes.
- Yes, maybe more help with the smart board instead of note taking.
- Yes.

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?

- Don't know what these services are.
- Don't know.
- He just got started with receiving assistance at school not too long ago so there hasn't been enough time yet to judge what he is going to need or if he will need this service.
- I am not sure what that in tales.
- I don't know.
- I strongly feel that this would be helpful for my student
- I think he would benefit from those services.
- I think it really helped her.
- I was just notified that these services are available to my child
- I would be interested in seeing what is offered, but it has never been presented as an option for us.
- I've never heard of it.

- If this service is summer school my child does attend and it does help with her progress.
- It is always a battle to get ESY services. Our daughter is significantly delayed, just because she doesn't "regress" doesn't mean she doesn't need services. Also, she receives less time (services) with ESY than regular education student do with summer school.
- My son has attended summer school and the jumpstart program for 7th graders. This was not offered to us - at the transition meeting for 6th to 7th grade - the special ed. rep. did not know it existed at their school. Jump start was in its 3rd year of existence. Many parents in this district do not know about ESY and it is highly discouraged.
- No.
- No.
- No he doesn't need the ESY.
- No he has made great strides!
- No he is making acceptable progress without it
- No, my child would not make more progress with ESY services.
- No, she is too tired at the end of the day due to her disabilities that she is not able to focus. She would not gain much from an extended day.
- No, there has been no indication that my child regresses during the summer months which would require ESY to prevent the need for remediation when the next school year begins.
- No.
- No. She has received them in the past but they were not helpful. Reiterating teaching methods that did not click with her learning style only compounded the problem.
- No. We really work on what we need to at home and I feel that is enough.
- Nope because if the teachers would do what they are suppose to begin with (provide him his accommodations) there is no reason for ESY!
- Possibly.
- Possibly.
- She attended special needs summer school for 2 years, but I didn't notice any difference when she didn't attend this last summer
- She might not have more progress, but she certainly would have less regression. As it is, we have to start over at the beginning of each school year.
- She would go to summer school but she goes with her mother for two months during the summer.
- The only area that would be helpful for ESY at this point would be continued speech services through the summer. We are also at a point where a summer job (with credit) would be an asset for preparation for life after graduation.
- This is the first year that he will not receive ESY. I'll know more at the beginning of next school year.
- We have not discussed this yet as data is being collected. This is his first year in the district.
- We just moved here and haven't had the opportunity. However in the past she has benefitted GREATLY from ESY services!!
- We pay for summer tutors on our own to give child one-on-one assistance during summers. School started an extended day program one day a week and our child has started with that.
- We would have to discuss options with her teacher/resource room teacher.
- When needed.
- Yes.
- Yes three times a week.

- Yes, more help in math and reading to keep her from losing ground.
- Yes, my child would benefit from the extended school year service.
- Yes.
- I don't know
- I'm sure he would, but it isn't necessary
- No
- No he continues to read throughout the summer on his own
- No, his behavior interrupts his learning.
- Not sure.
- Yes
- Yes.
- I can't tell he seems to be doing quite well as is.
- Hasn't but could get used to it.
- If the program fit her individual needs.
- Yes I believe he would make progress.

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?

- 1 on 1 aide.
- A lab top computer for note can't read his writing.
- A longer school day so he is exposed to more education activities.
- Already provided.
- An assistant should be available to help.
- An assistant to help him when problems arise.
- Continued services during the summer break.
- Don't know what else there is available.
- He has mental disabilities can't be in regular class rooms.
- I do think that her desk could be lowered or a step could be added for her feet. Her therapist from outside the district has assessed this and recommended it but her in school therapist does not seem to think it necessary.
- If a resource teacher or OT were in the classroom with our child, it would be beneficial. However, this is cost prohibited.
- If books could be on tape to take home it would be a great help - especially novels in English class and text books.
- If teachers would do what they are paid to do. Plenty of times my child has gone to a teacher for additional help or questions and has been "shrugged" off.
- Laptop computer he types faster than he writes.
- Lindamood-Bell program have made a world of difference for my child. She was in an extended day program last year from October and tested out in December with gains of 2 years!!! I am with the opinion that if seeing Stars would have been an intervention in 1st and/or 2nd grade; she would NOT have fallen so far behind. I am a proud supporter of Lindamood-Bell program and feel they should be required for all Resource students in need of reading and writing support.

- Maybe if the school would provide her with a tutor on some of the classes that she has in the regular classes.
- More therapists in the district--which would allow greater flexibility in scheduling therapy during appropriate time that does not conflict with academic time in the classroom.
- [REDACTED] sits with her during math, and helps her take notes and explains steps she is missing while she is taking the notes. She helps her try to organize the information. I think additional tutorial help with organization would help.
- My child needs a strategic tutor. The school said they could not pay for it, so I had to hire one myself. This tutor has significantly increased her progress in school and her desire to learn. With the economic stressors I am not sure how long I can continue to pay for these services. If it is what she needs why can't the school pay for it.
- School should more readily permit our child to take some regular courses but stay in those classes she needs help in. Once in those regular classes, perhaps the school could arrange for a peer mentor.
- Smaller classes.
- Teachers need to work harder with students. Stop worrying about their money. Teachers make too much money for doing nothing.
- They have provided him with a Para that is with him at all times, which I appreciate. However they have had some issues keeping one person in this position and the inconsistency has affected my son and his progress.
- Tutoring.
- Using technology, allowing him to use technology.
- YES! At the secondary level, the self contained PALS rooms could use more support staff (Para Educators). If these rooms were staffed adequately then the students could have the support to be in the regular class more often.
- Yes extended time on assignments, adjust his assignments to fit his learning level and PROVIDE HIM HIS ACCOMMODATIONS!
- Yes more one on one support.
- He needs a teacher like he had last year in school, he did great, till this year.
- More paraprofessionals are always needed to work with students in the regular classrooms. When provided they are a tremendous help.
- My child could go to a regular classroom if the classes were much smaller to make sure she gets taught what she does not understand.
- He could use a tutor.
- More speech.

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

9a. If yes, what could the school be doing?

- A little more communication with parent.
- Arranging IEP times with regular class room schedule. Math at the same time as his IEP math etc. My son feels not a part of regular class activities lost.
- Ask questions, offer reasonable, realistic suggestions, communicate with parents be willing to help.
- Attend speech therapy twice a week.

- Best thing to happen would be to get rid of all the standardized tests and allow time for students to receive an education that best meets their needs.
- Better communication about my child at the beginning of each school year and not talking about my child's special education in front of peers in general education classroom.
- Better communication between ALL teachers, administrators and all other staff involved in my child's education/IEP. More training for teachers to recognize and be aware of students with disabilities to teach more effectively.
- Better contact with parents when grades fall.
- Bring a bible study to the schools for education to children of god's word, help keep them out of trouble for present and future.
- Challenging him more. Addressing other kids behavioral problems that disrupt classroom learning.
- District could provide some form of extended year services that address maintenance of behavioral processes, instead of just summer school for grades.
- Expect more from him.
- Giving her dyslexia assessment and intervention.
- Giving more time on tests. Hands on assignments with book learning. Less reading, which she has problems with in regards to text books.
- Her primary teacher really needs to take every child's needs into account instead my daughter seems to get pushed to the side. She's mainly in resource room due to teacher not caring enough.
- I am very satisfied with my child's school. I think it is important to teach students how to use a planner. I think it would be helpful if 6th grade students work with a planner that is similar to the junior high planners and organization techniques are taught.
- I am very surprised that it is taking 3 years of IEP for a speech therapy issue with my child. The teacher only visits with us 1 time per year about any progress.
- I asked if my daughter could go to a different school. I talked to [REDACTED] and the answer was no she did better at Alta Vista Elementary. I hate Pioneer Park so next year I will try St. Mary's.
- I feel that he is not gaining as much progress this yr as he did last yr. Don't think he gets as much one to one help as he needs to progress successfully.
- I see that my child has many gaps in her education. This makes is very hard for her to move from one concept to another. The gaps need to be addressed before moving on to new material.
- I think starting in elementary school when my child does papers and gets most of them wrong the material should be reviewed with my child in order for her to get it right.
- I think that the teacher should try more alternative methods and not be so rigid in expecting all the kids to learn the same way, also my child needs more prompts and assistance remembering things and she states they need to learn to be more responsible and she shouldn't have to remind them.
- Looking at matching him with teachers that understand his disability and works with him.
- Make sure that the Para/teacher/other assisting adults understand better how a child with ADHD behaves and that sometimes those behaviors are not intentional misbehaviors that should be punished but rather the child's need to be instructed on how to better handle that particular situation.
- My child has a diagnosed tongue thrust that impacts her speech (and consequently her writing/spelling because of her poor pronunciation). The school refuses to provide her speech services so I am forced to find this separately for her.

- My child is on a k-1st grade reading level and can't read very well and it frustrates him. He wasn't even recommended for the bit program.
- Needs more speech one on one, and less in group. Would like to know if there is a summer course for speech.
- Not all children will be able to learn at the regular case in the general classroom. A lot of the IEP children feel left behind, and are frustrated that they are left behind. Not all children can succeed into being main streamed into a regular classroom.
- Often resource classes have students with behavior issues. My daughter does not have behavior problems. I wish she could be in a class of students who just struggle with their subjects, not behavior.
- Once again if the classes were staffed correctly, each child could have more success in reaching their goals. The school needs to help each student find their strengths.
- Pay for strategic tutor.
- Preparing him for after high school more guidance counseling regarding career choices.
- Same as 8.
- Sending home work/progress sheets on what our child is learning for the week.
- Take her out of mainstream classes.
- Talk to the parents and get teachers that do not humiliate them in front of their people.
- Teach them instead of worrying about doing this project and that project. Providing him textbooks like he is allowed to have on his IEP but we have never been given any textbooks so helping at home is very hard to do!
- Technology.
- The school does a great job with funding available. If the school had more funding then they could provide more one-on-one that this child needs. Encouraging all elementary and middle school to host after school programs would not only help this child but a broader population.
- The summer school/ESY issue. ESY sometimes (2 out of the 4 years) looks like a babysitting service rather than an academic setting.
- There is always room for improvement. But I know the Central High staff is doing the best, and I am very pleased with the work and progress my son has made at Central High.
- To offer all services at our school.
- Understanding what is causing the delays, and how to best deal with her specific needs.
- Updates on how our child is doing.
- Using/having smaller class sizes.
- We just started as I said before, but in time we will see if anything else is needed and they are very open to address anything that I may see needing to be done.
- Yes - actually making all homework accessible from all classes- either online or via telephone request.
- You guys have really worked hard - [REDACTED] have went the distance for my son. A special thank you.
- Hire better teachers, like he had last year.
- Maybe working more on social skills.
- More individualized instruction and let parents know what they can do to help with their child's progress.
- Not enough individualized help in regards to my child's educational needs; he is not progressing adequately.
- Not his educational needs, but the school could do more to improve my son's social experience.

- One on one.
- A part time job at school.
- Helping us more with his homework.
- Keeping in contact with the parents.
- More hands on teaching.
- Yes, work more with him. Keep others behaviors under control so it is not as much of a distraction.

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

- Although my son is making great progress, I feel "out of the loop" at his current school. I rarely if ever hear from his therapists and have no idea what they are doing. At his previous pre-school I got weekly reports.
- At the beginning of the school year the school tried to take my daughter out of a specialized math class and put her in the regular classroom and tried to convince me that this is what had been discussed prior to school starting. I did not appreciate her approach or the tone of voice she used in discussing this with me. I felt she was rude and treated me ignorantly. I think more could be accomplished if the school treated parents with more dignity and respect. I want what is best for my child, even if that conflicts with what is best or easiest for the school. I feel that should be the district's policy, also. I also feel that weekly, or the very least, monthly progress reports should be sent home. I truly have no idea what my child's progress is or what she should be working on at home for extra help. My child is not going to get an IEP the next time she is tested and will be thrown into a regular math class whether she is caught up to the other kids or not, I feel pretty helpless to.
- Buffalo Ridge Elementary has done an excellent job with meeting my children's needs. I see such an improvement and am happy with their services.
- Central High School in Cheyenne is amazing. UPLIFT organization is tremendous.
- Everyone at my child's school has been nothing but wonderful with him. He is learning and developing at a progress that I am amazed with. School has been the most positive and encouraging thing since we discovered his disability and I wouldn't want to go to any other school district (or school for that matter).
- Feel there should be a teacher's aide for classes larger than 15.
- General education teachers need to be better trained on how to help children with learning disabilities.
- Great team. Especially [REDACTED]
- I am an educator in my child's school so I have had to be very active in her IEP. I am not sure it would have been followed up on as closely if I were not in the school to monitor it as much. I think there needs to be more done in the way for Occupational Therapy and Physical therapy in school so outside help would not have to be sought as much.
- I am very happy with my daughters IEP. [REDACTED] is awesome as well as all of the other teachers I have spoken with. I wish I would have had this kind of help when I was in high school in California, in math.
- I am very happy with the progress my son has made especially this year.
- I am very pleased with the schools attempts with my son. He is very stubborn sometimes and will refuse to try so I don't have any disagreements with the school.
- I feel my child needs tutoring to be successful, and I feel the school should pay for this service as it greatly enhances her graduation from high school outcome.

- I feel very confident in the team helping my daughter [REDACTED] is absolutely the best.
- I have always known that my daughter had a small problem with her speech but thought she would grow out of it. When the school got in touch with me and her teacher, and the speech teacher and myself sat down to talk about her that's when I saw she could use some help. I'm so glad that they were intune with her enough to see she needed their help.
- I have emailed (in the past) [REDACTED] regarding the summer school/ESY issue and not had a response.
- I have had a continuous problem with her para that I have been unable to resolve. Instead of helping my daughter, she frequently does portions of my daughter's work for her. I am going in to talk with her teacher about this (again) as soon as possible. I do think the paras need to be held accountable for their actions, and they should understand that they are there to help the students understand the assignments, answer questions the students have, and in general help the students do the best they can. They are NOT there to complete any portion of an assignment for the students. I have spoken to the school about this a couple of times already (between last year and this year) and I am very frustrated that I need to go and speak to them yet again. We will be moving in a couple months so my daughter will not be back at Bain Elementary next year, and I am sincerely hoping that Dildine is easier to work with than Bain has been.
- I have never been so lost and unaware of what my son is doing or accomplishing in school ever since he started this IEP in first grade now a fifth grader. Very upset and disappointed in your IEP program at Henderson.
- I hope my daughter could go to St. Mary's it's two blocks from my house. I hope I can afford it.
- I only wish that the schools had better training on the alternative ways to handle a child with ADHD rather than suggest that medication is the only way.
- I think that Alta Vista is a wonderful school. The teachers and staff are wonderful. I am very pleased with the school. Thanks.
- I think that [REDACTED] did a very good job working with my son. He has made so much progress with her that she released him from the speech program, but still keeps a listen out on his everyday speech. She also gave us the option to place him back in if we feel that he has lost what he had gained.
- I think that her teachers are doing an amazing job as well as her speech and her OC. Keep up the good work.
- I think that the school should try alternative methods with children of disabilities and not expect them to perform at the same level as the other children.
- I think this is the best program for students. I know that my student went from D's and F's to A's and B's. I am very happy with Central High Staff and all that they have done and are continuing to do.
- I would like [REDACTED] to attend summer school again.
- I'm not sure that my experience is a fair assessment of the SE dept. in this area as I have been involved in advocacy and rights for so long that the teachers don't really need to encourage or explain. I really work more with the regular ed. teachers at my son's school. My son has a learning disability and ADHD which can make him a bit challenging at times but he is a good, polite kid at the same time who plays sports and enjoys school and learning.

- In the 7 years my daughter has attended Davis Elementary, the staff, teachers, and educational assistants have been outstanding. I have been informed of all concerns, and a phone call has never not been returned. This school has gone out of its way to address any problem or discuss various types of learning environments to help my daughter succeed. I am very pleased with the education and the services we have been blessed to receive here in Cheyenne.
- In the transition from elementary to Jr. High, I believe that there is not enough communication with parents and all personnel involved in this process to help the parent/student understand what will take place in these kinds of transitions.
- It took the school a year to finally get my child tested because they were behind, I really like the school but my child is struggling because they took too long for this testing and I was always asking when it was going to happen.
- Johnson is a great school; I just wish my son would realize that and take advantage of getting an education.
- [REDACTED] the admin has been so accommodating and wonderful to work with.
- [REDACTED] are among those professionals that have been invaluable in accommodating [REDACTED] at every turn, and enabling him to attain the best education possible. WDE, LCSD 1, EHS, and our community are tremendously well served by this team of outstanding people. They care, and it shows.
- [REDACTED] does not need to be an elementary school teacher, my daughter hates school this year due to issues with this teacher.
- My Child's school is giving my son that best they can give. I see lots of improvement.
- My child has had "special needs" since 2nd grade. Through the years I was told by teachers, social workers etc. That he did not have ADHD just recently through others resources my child has been diagnosed as severe ADHD. I am not happy with any of the people that have been involved. My child has been looked at differently and I have been looked at as a parent that cannot take care of or control my child.
- My child has met all her goals - she was released from special education spring semester 2009.
- My child is getting all the needs he needs. Has improved a lot.
- My child's school does a very good job.
- My child's school even helps find out of school help for his problems.
- My husband and I were the ones who suggested the TLC program. We felt we had no other option other than our daughter being suspended on a constant basis. We are happy with the program so far.
- My son's elementary school is worse - they like to pick on kids and get defensive when parents ask questions. They have crazy suggestions and are unwilling to help plus they give dirty looks and gang up on you.
- My son's has had great teachers and is doing very well academically--we worry about him some in social situations. I don't believe that the school is doing a very good job in educating and informing other children about disabilities and compassion for those who have a disability.
- My son's school has been fantastic and very responsive to the needs of my son. I am very happy.
- No.
- None.

- Our daughter now spends a large majority of her time in the general classroom. She has made the honor roll twice already this year and am informed she is making tremendous progress. I am grateful for the time and attention she is getting with her teachers at Dildine!
- Rossman Elementary is a great school, and they do everything possible for my children.
- Some of the special education support staff - could actually be supportive of the students instead of being discouraging or making discouraging comments.
- Speech teacher is not available and is hard to get a hold of due to moving between schools.
- [REDACTED] teacher.. [REDACTED] deserves an award. She's great with [REDACTED] Not all teachers can handle him but she can, with care. Thank you.
- Thank you all for what you have done for my school.
- The IEP has truly helped [REDACTED] immensely. She has come a long way and she couldn't have done it without [REDACTED] help and the other teachers she has had.
- The IEP meetings are in depth but their only twice a year. What happens in-between is concerning.
- The counselors at the school have been very supportive of our (parents) efforts to help our daughter succeed. But all of us are limited by the rigidity of the educational system.
- The principal at Freedom doesn't not encourage parental participation especially if they disagree with a decision of the school. His teacher didn't want me to provide input about any of his learning.
- The school needs to listen to me as a parent about her education. I know what she is capable of.
- They are not doing their job.
- This is all new to us so at this time they seem to be doing a good job in assisting my son.
- This program has been very helpful to my daughter and myself. Thanks so much.
- Transition services in LCSD1 are laughable. This is my daughters second year where this staff has done little with her besides showing up at IEP. First year the issue was money but by year end they had money to throw a big BBQ. This year the lady working with my daughter took 2 1/2 months to just meet her.
- [REDACTED] has been so great and helpful to my daughter [REDACTED] We love her to death.
- We feel our child is doing wonderful at Davis Elementary.
- We have worked with this district for 10 years now and have seen many changes, both progressive and perhaps just change for change's sake. For the most part we have been pleased with our daughter's progress and the services she has received. There have been times when adjustments have been necessary, and I have been thankful for the flexibility when needed.
- Would like to see weekly homework/activities sent home with child.
- Yes, I would really like to say I am so sick and tired of every single year having to teach the staff in my son's school what his IEP is and says! This should already be something they all know about before he enters their classrooms. I get tired of fighting every single year as well to make sure they are all giving him his accommodations. Then I get told that is his responsibility to ask for his accommodations! Excuse me my son is not paid to do that and plus he has no clue what his accommodations are and is too embarrassed to ask for help.
- No.
- None at this time but I have not been very happy with the process of singling out my child for reading resource class.
- Thank you.

- Yes, I would love a phone call about this matter, when my son was to take the paws test he was to have a scribe with him, but on Mar. 11th, he had to share a scribe with 3 or 4 others, and we had to call school about this matter, and they said they didn't have enough scribes for each child, but they were the ones that picked the dates and times that my child had to take the test, so they should have been prepared. My son complained to the teacher, and she tried to argue with him. But she does not know that I was standing outside the door watching him for over 20 mins. and no one was sitting next to him at all. I don't think that the teacher he has working with him this year is very good at working with my son. The teacher that worked with him last year was great, I could see big improvement, but this year he was going backwards fast. That is why I would love a phone call about this matter. Thanks for your time.
- I am very thankful for this program. Our does a great job. Thanks.
- This has been very helpful for my son and I greatly appreciate the work that [REDACTED] has done with him and helped us as parents. She keeps us well informed.
- My childs teacher is wonderful. She works with the goals that I have for my child. The IEP was the worst process ever. I feel sorry for the parents that do not know the rights of their children because administration is only doing the bare minimum for the children unless you take a stand. This is the worst school district dealing with IEPs. LCSD #2, much better.
- Parents should take a major role in their child's education. Not be made to feel uncomfortable or discourage to come in the classroom itself.

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Demographics for
Laramie County School District #1**

Ethnicity	N	%
White	146	84%
Hispanic	12	7%
Black	10	6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	4	2%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Autism	9	5%
Cognitive Disability	11	6%
Emotional Disability	18	10%
Hearing impairment (including Deafness)	1	1%
Other Health Impairment	26	15%
Specific Learning Disability	72	42%
Multiple Disabilities	1	1%
Orthopedic Impairment	2	1%
Speech/Language Impairment	33	19%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten	12	7%
Grades 1-6	101	60%
Grades 7-8	22	13%
Grades 9-12	33	19%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	96	55%
Resource Room	54	31%
Separate Classroom	23	13%