



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

PLATTE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #2

April 20 – 22, 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

Platte County School District #2
School Year: 2008 – 2009
Date of On-Site Review: April 20 – 22, 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 are 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

Platte County School District #2 (PCSD #2) is considered an extra-small school district and reported a special education population of 41 students on its 2008 WDE-427 report. Thus, the district's 2007 – 2008 data was ranked against data from all other extra-small 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	PCSD #2 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding PCSD #2
#3C Secondary Reading Proficiency	10.00%	28.20%
#3C Secondary Math Proficiency	20.00%	34.34%

Because of the low number of students with disabilities in Platte #2, caution is warranted when comparing these percentages to the state rate. In a district of this size, even one student can greatly affect the data examined here. With that caveat in mind, it should be noted that PCSD #2 scored below the overall state proficiency rates for both secondary mathematics and reading. Among other eligible districts in its population group, Platte #2 had the second lowest PAWS proficiency rate for math and the lowest PAWS proficiency rate for reading. When these proficiency rates were averaged and compared to other extra-small districts, PCSD #2's score was one of the two lowest, and the district was selected for an on-site monitoring visit.

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

Focused Monitoring Conditions for Platte County School District #2

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 (November 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 four areas: 1) FAPE – Educational Benefit; 2) FAPE – Assistive Technology; 3) FAPE – Related Services; and 4) Least Restrictive Environment.

1. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was based on the district's relatively low PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities.
2. **FAPE – Assistive Technology** This hypothesis was formulated due to district data reporting zero students receiving Assistive Technology services.
3. **FAPE – Related Services (Behavior)** This hypothesis was formulated due to the district's extremely small number of students receiving Counseling, Psychological Services, and/or Social Work as related services.
4. **Least Restrictive Environment** This hypothesis was developed to probe the district's comparatively high percentage of students in separate school environments.

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 four 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.

Results of On-Site Monitoring for Platte County School District #2

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

Area 1: FAPE – Educational Benefit

A. Citation

§300.101 Free appropriate public education (FAPE).

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

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

§300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP.

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

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

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

- (A) Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals described in §300.320(a)(2), and in the general education curriculum, if appropriate;*
- (B) The results of any reevaluation conducted under §300.303;*
- (C) Information about the child provided to, or by, the parents, as described under §300.305(a)(2);*
- (D) The child's anticipated needs; or*
- (E) Other matters.*

B. Evidence

1. Data

As mentioned above in the introduction of this report, the WDE noted that 2008 PAWS proficiency rates among students with disabilities in Platte #2 were below the overall state rates for both reading and mathematics at the middle and high school levels. Probing deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 26 of the district's students with disabilities scored 'Basic' or 'Below Basic' on two or three PAWS subtests (Reading, Writing and Math) during their most recent statewide testing. The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

From this group of 26 students, the WDE identified fifteen students who took the PAWS test in 2008 (or 2007 if currently enrolled in a non-test-taking grade) and did not score 'Proficient' on at least one subtest. In addition, the Department identified five students in non-test-taking grades with a primary disability label of Learning Disability (LD) or Speech/Language Disability (SL) who were placed in regular education environments.

2. File Review

Using these twenty 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, five students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

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

This reduction left fifteen 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 students' situations:

- 8 of the 15 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.
- 7 out of 15 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 2 of the 15 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- 2 of the 15 files indicated a lack of adequate or expected progress toward at least one of the students' IEP goals. Of these 2 files, neither contained evidence that the IEP teams reconvened to address the students' lack of progress.

- In 6 of the 15 files, the student's level of progress was unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 2 out of 15 files contained a program of special education and related services that did not appear to address the student's needs and goals adequately. In 1 additional file, the provision of related services was documented, but the type of service was not specified.
- 4 out of 15 students were failing at least one core academic class (mathematics, language arts, science, social studies) according to their most recent grade reports.

3. Interviews

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

- For two 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 both cases, the students' needs had changed since their most recent evaluation, and both of them were making progress toward their IEP goals.
- Regarding one student, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that the student was now making progress and receiving educational benefit.

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

- Regarding a secondary school student who is not yet a fluent reader, a staff member reported that the school and the student have "come to a truce" about the student's lack of reading skills.
- When asked about reconvening the IEP team to address one student's clear lack of progress, a teacher stated, "[Staff member's name] and I were just talking about that." The meeting had not been scheduled.
- When asked if a student would make progress if he/she received additional services, a staff member replied, "I'm sure. Absolutely, if at all possible." However, the interviewee added that service minutes on IEPs are "...based on scheduling. I guess we didn't have a choice for [student name]."
- Regarding a student who has a history of poor attendance and whose absences are negatively affecting his/her educational progress, a teacher reported, "The student doesn't have attendance goals. [Student name] has reading and writing goals." However, the teacher also added, "I think [student name] would benefit from an attendance plan."
- When a staff member was asked about reconvening the IEP team due to a particular student's lack of progress, he/she replied, "We just haven't sat down and had that conversation. We just know [student name] is struggling."
- When a service provider was asked about one student's lack of an IEP goal in an area of service, the staff member stated, "There is no goal. There is something

written in the IEP, but I couldn't tell you what it says." The staff member added, "The student and I haven't met as often as we should."

- Regarding one student's progress, a teacher noted that the student "...is struggling right now, probably since Christmas." The IEP team had not reconvened to address the student's lack of progress.
- When asked about an IEP goal for a student's Study Skills service, a staff member stated, "We used to write goals for Study Skills" but stopped the practice when it became difficult to individualize the goals and ensure measurability.
- A staff member mentioned that Extended School Year (ESY) services might be of benefit to one particular student. However, the staff member stated, "I don't know that [student name] would qualify under ESY."
- A teacher reported that one student appears to be "quietly doing nothing" while his/her grades suffer. The IEP team had not yet reconvened.

C. Finding

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

Area 2: FAPE – 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 WDE-425 and July 2008 WDE-427 data collections, none of the 41 students with disabilities in PCSD #2 were reportedly receiving Assistive Technology (AT) services. This number is notable when compared to the overall percentage of students receiving AT in the State's 47 other districts, which stood at roughly 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 totaled ten students and was composed of three specific types of students: 1) students with special education eligibility under the Autism (AT), Cognitive Disability (CD), Hearing Impaired (HI), or Multiple Disabilities (MU) criteria; 2) students with a primary disability label of Speech/Language who were reportedly receiving Occupational Therapy as a related service, and 3) students identified under any other disability category who participated in the PAWS-ALT statewide assessment in 2008. The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might need Assistive Technology devices or services in order to receive FAPE.

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

- Four files did not contain evidence to suggest a need for Assistive Technology.
- One student appeared to be receiving an appropriate amount and/or type of AT services.

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

- 2 of 5 files contained evaluation comments indicating that the students might benefit from Assistive Technology.
- 0 of the 5 student files contained evidence of an Assistive Technology assessment.
- 2 out of 5 student files contained information indicating that the student might need Assistive Technology in the 'Summary of Evaluation' or 'Present Levels of Performance' sections of the IEP.

- 1 of the 5 students was failing to make adequate/expected progress in one or more areas of need that might be addressed through the provision of AT devices or services. This single student's file contained no evidence that the IEP team had reconvened to address his/her lack of progress.
- In 1 of the 5 files, the WDE could not determine the student's levels of progress due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.

3. Interviews

At the conclusion of the file review, WDE staff interviewed Platte #2 special education staff and related service providers regarding these five students' educational needs and their use of Assistive Technology. As a result of the interviews, the WDE removed four of the five students from the subsample for the following reasons:

- For two students, district staff gave compelling reasons as to why neither student needed AT services or devices.
- Two students were in fact receiving AT services and/or using AT devices.

However, for the one remaining student, the following interview details support the State's hypothesis that some PCSD #2 students who are not receiving AT may actually need these devices and/or services in order to receive FAPE:

Student One

- This particular student was previously taught sign language in order to compensate for his/her difficulties with verbal communication. However, the sign language instruction was discontinued.
- When asked about the possibility of a communication board to assist the student in his/her interactions with peers and teachers, a staff member noted, "I think that might help [student name]. That would be an incredible tool."
- Another staff member believed a communication board would be valuable to the student in the future but not now. When asked to elaborate, the staff member could not explain why the device would not be valuable to the student in the present.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find PCSD #2 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 is not required to address this area in its Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

However, for the single student discussed under Section 3 above, the district must reconvene the student's IEP team within 45 business days of the date of this report and reconsider his/her potential need for Assistive Technology devices and/or services. The student's WISER ID number can be found in the report's cover letter. If the IEP team is unsure about determining the student's AT needs, the team should conduct an AT assessment to aid in the selection of certain devices or services. The WDE must be notified in writing regarding these IEP meetings and any resulting changes made to the students' IEPs.

D. Recommendation

The WDE recommends that PCSD #2 ensures the provision of Assistive Technology devices and/or services for any student who may need them in order to receive FAPE. The WDE also recommends that all services necessary for a student to receive FAPE are documented in the student's IEP and reported accurately to the Department on the WDE-425 and WDE-427 data reports.

Area 3: FAPE – Related Services (Behavior)

A. Citation

§300.34 Related services.

- (a) *General. Related services means transportation and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services as are required to assist a child with a disability to benefit from special education, and includes speech-language pathology and audiology services, interpreting services, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, including therapeutic recreation, early identification and assessment of disabilities in children, counseling services, including rehabilitation counseling, orientation and mobility services, and medical services for diagnostic or evaluation purposes. Related services also include school health services and school nurse services, social work services in schools, and parent counseling and training.*
- (2) *Counseling services means services provided by qualified social workers, psychologists, guidance counselors, or other qualified personnel.*
- (10) *Psychological services includes –*
 - (i) *Administering psychological and educational tests, and other assessment procedures;*
 - (ii) *Interpreting assessment results;*
 - (iii) *Obtaining, integrating, and interpreting information about child behavior and conditions relating to learning;*
 - (iv) *Consulting with other staff members in planning school programs to meet the special education needs of children as indicated by psychological tests, interviews, direct observation, and behavioral evaluations;*
 - (v) *Planning and managing a program of psychological counseling for children and parents; and*
 - (vi) *Assisting in developing positive behavioral intervention strategies.*
- (14) *Social work services in schools includes –*
 - (i) *Preparing a social or developmental history on a child with a disability;*
 - (ii) *Group and individual counseling with the child and family;*
 - (iii) *Working in partnership with parents and others on those problems in a child's living situation (home, school, and community) that affect the child's adjustment in school;*
 - (iv) *Mobilizing school and community resources to enable the child to learn as effectively as possible in his or her educational program; and*
 - (v) *Assisting in developing positive behavioral intervention strategies.*

B. Evidence

1. Data

In reviewing special education data from Platte #2 (WDE-425 and WDE-427), the WDE ascertained that only two students with disabilities reportedly received Counseling (CS),

Psychological Services (PS), and/or Social Work (SW) services during the 2007 – 2008 school year. These students represented 5% of the district's students with disabilities, which contrasts with Wyoming's comparable overall percentage of 21%. In response to these data, the WDE identified four students who scored 'Below Basic' on all three 2008 PAWS subtests. The WDE hypothesized that one or more of these four students might be in need of CS, PS, and/or SW related services in order to receive FAPE.

2. File Review

The four students mentioned above constituted the WDE's purposeful sample for this hypothesis. Once on-site in Guernsey, the monitoring team reviewed these students' special education files in order to determine whether or not any of them might need social/emotional related services in order to receive FAPE.

Through the file review process, all four students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Three student files contained no evidence of a need for behavioral, social, or emotional supports and/or services.
- One student recently transferred out of the district.

Because all of the student files in this sample were removed from consideration through the file review process, the WDE did not take any further steps in its exploration of this issue.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find PCSD #2 noncompliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – Related Services (Behavior) 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 PCSD #2 ensures the provision of Counseling, Psychological Services and/or Social Work for any student who may need these services in order to receive FAPE. The WDE also recommends that all services necessary for a student to receive FAPE are documented in the student's IEP and reported accurately to the Department on the WDE-425 and WDE-427 data reports.

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 Platte #2 appeared to have a comparatively high percentage of its students with disabilities placed in "Separate School" or "SS" settings. According to the combined December 2007 WDE-425 and July 2008 WDE-427 reports, the district's percentage of students in SS placements was approximately 7%, more than double the state's overall rate of roughly 3%. The WDE hypothesized that there may be some students in SS 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 Platte #2 students reported to be placed in Separate School settings. All of the sample's students in SS settings were identified as having a Cognitive Disability (CD). Given these parameters, the total number of students in the State's LRE sample came to three students.

Once on-site in Guernsey, WDE staff reviewed these three students' special education files. Through the file review process, all three of the students were removed from the sample when the WDE team determined that each student's file contained an appropriate placement justification, explaining why a more restrictive setting was necessary. Because all of the student files in this sample were removed from consideration through the file review process, the WDE did not take any further steps in its exploration of this issue.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find Platte #2 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).

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, 60 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 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 Platte #1. The Department mailed a hard copy of the Parent Survey and a cover letter to each parent of a student currently receiving special education services in the district. Parents had the option of completing the survey on paper or completing it online. The WDE mailed a total of 31 surveys, but only two parents returned completed surveys. Because the number of responses was so small in relation to the total number of parents who received a survey, the WDE has opted to protect the anonymity of the respondents by not including their responses in this report. However, for the district's information, the blank survey is included in Appendix B of this report.

File Review 1602000	Number of files reviewed	Percent of files compliant
B. Most Recent Evaluation / Reevaluation		
B1. The file contains a current evaluation	25	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))	25	96.00 %
B5. Prior written notice includes a description of the action the public agency is proposing or refusing. (300.503(b)(1))	25	68.00 %
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))	25	96.00 %
B19. As part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the IEP team reviewed current classroom based, local or state assessments. (300.305(a)(1)(ii))	25	100.00 %
B22. The file contains documentation that, as part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status and motor abilities. (300.304)(c)(4))	25	96.00 %
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))	25	100.00 %
C9. There is documentation that the public agency provided a copy of the evaluation report and documentation of the eligibility determination to the parent. (300.306(a)(2))	25	36.00 %
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))	25	100.00 %
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))	25	52.00 %
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.	25	96.00 %
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))	25	96.00 %
E26. The IEP includes the child's present levels of academic and functional performance including how the child's disability affects his/her progress in the general curriculum (or for preschool children, participation in appropriate activities). (300.320(a)(1)(i)), (300.320(a)(1)(ii))	25	92.00 %

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))	25	88.00 %
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	25	12.00 %
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))	25	96.00 %
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))	25	96.00 %
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))	25	100.00 %
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))	25	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))	25	100.00 %
G. ESY		
G1. The file contains a parent notice that ESY services will be considered	25	68.00 %

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

Total Respondents: N/A

Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 31

Response Rate: N/A

	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.							
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.							
3. My child's educational needs are being adequately addressed by the school.							
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.							
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.							

6. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her academic needs and improve your child's progress in school? 6a. If yes, what could the school be doing?	Yes	No	Don't Know
7. Does your child receive Assistive Technology (AT) 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?	Yes	No	Don't Know
8. Does your child receive counseling, psychological services, or social work services at school? 8a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? 8b. If yes, do you think the type and amount of these services is appropriate for your child?	Yes	No	Don't Know
9. Are there any additional supports, services, or equipment that would enable your child to spend more time in the regular classroom? 9a. If yes, please describe.	Yes	No	Don't Know

	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.								
11. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.								
12. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.								
13. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.								
14. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.								

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

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

Ethnicity	N	%
White		
Hispanic		
Native American		
Black		
Asian		

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Autism		
Cognitive Disability		
Traumatic Brain Injury		
Specific Learning Disability		
Speech/Language Impairment		
Emotional Disability		
Other Health Impairment		
Visual Impairment		
Hearing Impairment		
Orthopedic Impairment		
Deaf-Blindness		
Multiple Disabilities		
Developmental Delay		

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten		
Grades 1-6		
Grades 7-8		
Grades 9-12		

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment		
Resource Room		
Separate Classroom		
Separate School/Facility		