



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

SUBLETTE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #9

October 27 – 30, 2008

**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

Sublette County School District #9

School Year: 2008 – 2009

Date of On-Site Review: October 27 – 30, 2008

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

Sublette County School District #9 (SCSD #9) is considered a small school district and reported a special education population of 88 students on its most recent WDE-425 report. Thus, the district's 2007 – 2008 data was ranked against data from all other 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	SCSD #9 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding SCSD #9
#3C Secondary Reading Proficiency	9.09%	28.27%
#3C Secondary Math Proficiency	13.64%	34.43%

In terms of the variables that are included in the weighted formula, SCSD #9 scored below the state rate on both. In addition, when compared to other small districts, the district's mathematics and reading proficiency rates were the third lowest among districts in that population group. When these proficiency rates were combined and compared to other small districts, SCSD #9's score was one of the two lowest of eligible districts, 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 Sublette County School District #9

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed the district's 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-630 and 631. The data led the WDE to create hypotheses in two areas: 1) FAPE – Assistive Technology and 2) FAPE – Educational Benefit.

1. **FAPE – Assistive Technology** This hypothesis was formulated due to district data reporting zero students receiving Assistive Technology.
2. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was based on the district's relatively low PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities.

Details regarding the development of both hypotheses and information on how the WDE determined its samples for them are found below in the introduction to each finding area.

In addition to the two hypotheses chosen for on-site focused monitoring, the WDE also monitored other areas for IDEA compliance through a procedural compliance review of each file reviewed during testing of the aforementioned hypotheses. Results of the review are included with this report in Appendix A. Appendix B contains the results of a parent survey that was conducted in the district during a four-week window that included the dates of the on-site monitoring visit.

Results of On-Site Monitoring for Sublette #9

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 WDE-425 and 427 collections, none of the 94 students with disabilities in S CSD #9 received Assistive Technology (AT) as a related service. This number is not able 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. None of the students were reportedly receiving Assistive Technology, and any student with a primary disability label of Learning Disability (SL) or Speech/Language (SL) was excluded from the sample. The sample totaled 14 students whose general characteristics are described below:

- Seven students receiving Occupational Therapy (OT) services who did not take the PAWS or PAWS-ALT in 2008 (due to their enrollment in grades K, 1, 2, 9, 10, or 12)
- Three students receiving OT who took the PAWS or PAWS-ALT in 2008 and scored 'Basic' or 'Below Basic' on at least one of the subtests (reading, writing, mathematics)
- Four students with a primary disability label of Autism (AT) or Multiple Disabilities (MU)

The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might need Assistive Technology devices or services in order to receive FAPE.

Once on-site in Big Piney, the WDE reviewed these 14 students' special education files. Through the file review process, nine files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- 3 students were determined to be receiving an appropriate amount and/or type of Assistive Technology.
- 3 students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- 2 students did not demonstrate a need for AT.
- 1 student passed away in late 2007.

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 out of 5 files contained evidence of any sort of Assistive Technology assessment.
- 4 out of 5 student files contained information indicating that the student might need Assistive Technology in the IEP “Needs” or “Present Levels” section.
- In the “Special Factors” section of the IEP, 4 of the 5 students were noted to *not* need Assistive Technology—in spite of the information listed in the Present Levels section. Furthermore, 1 of the 5 students had an IEP in which the AT question under Special Factors was not answered.
- In 3 of the 5 files, the student’s level of progress was unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.

3. Interviews

At the conclusion of the file review, WDE staff interviewed Sublette #9 special education staff and related service providers regarding these five students’ educational needs and their use of Assistive Technology. All five of the students were removed from the subsample for the following reasons:

- 3 of the 5 were removed from the subsample when the WDE learned that these students were in fact receiving some type of AT services.
- 2 of the 5 students were removed from the subsample during the interview process when district staff provided compelling reasons why these particular students were not in need of AT devices or services.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find SCSD #9 non-compliant 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 Sublette #9 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 – Educational Benefit

A. Citation

§300.101 Free appropriate public education (FAPE).

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

(c) Children advancing from grade to grade. (1) Each State must ensure that FAPE is available to any individual child with a disability who needs special education and related services, even though the child has not failed or been retained in a course or grade, and is advancing from grade to grade. (2) The determination that a child described in

paragraph (a) of this section is eligible under this part, must be made on an individual basis by the group responsible within the child's LEA for making eligibility determinations.

§300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP.

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

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

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

(A) Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals described in §300.320(a)(2), and in the general education curriculum, if appropriate;

(B) The results of any reevaluation conducted under §300.303;

(C) Information about the child provided to, or by, the parents, as described under §300.305(a)(2);

(D) The child's anticipated needs; or

(E) Other matters.

B. Evidence

1. Data

As noted above in the introduction of this report, the WDE noted that PAWS proficiency rates among students with disabilities in Sublette #9 were below the overall state rates for both language arts and mathematics. Digging deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 35 of the district's students with disabilities scored Below Basic on at least one of the PAWS subtests (reading, writing, mathematics). 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 these 34 of these 35 students² as its purposeful sample, the WDE reviewed special education files as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, seven students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- 4 students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- 2 students moved or transferred out of the district.
- 1 student exited special education after being found no longer eligible for services.

This reduction left 27 students remaining in the sample. Each of the remaining files exhibited one or more of the following characteristics, prompting the WDE to further examine these student situations:

- 8 of the 27 files exhibited a “disconnect” between needs identified in assessment reports and the needs listed in the IEP. In other words, not all of the student

² One of the 35 students was placed in a Separate Facility and was removed from the sample prior to the on-site visit.

needs identified through the evaluation process were included in these students' IEPs.

- 12 out of 27 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 20 of the 27 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- 4 of the 27 files indicated a lack of adequate or expected progress toward at least one of the student's IEP goals. Of these four files, none contained evidence that the IEP team reconvened to address the student's lack of progress.
- In 18 of the 27 files, the student's level of progress was unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- 6 of the 27 IEPs were implemented recently and had not yet reached the first progress reporting period.
- In 19 of 27 files, the "Supplementary Aids and Services" section of the IEP was completely blank.
- 3 out of 27 files stated that accommodations were to be provided on an "as needed" basis, indicating an unclear commitment to the delivery of these supports.

3. Interviews

Following the file review, special education staff, general education teachers, and related service providers were interviewed regarding these 27 specific students. Through the interview process, 12 additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding 7 of the 12 students, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were now making progress and receiving educational benefit.
- For 4 of the 12 students, those interviewed were able to provide compelling evidence that these students' needs were in fact being adequately addressed through the provision of special education and related services. In most of these cases, the students' needs had changed since the most recent triennial evaluation.
- For one student who appeared to not have a goal in one of his/her areas of need, staff explained how a particular IEP goal corresponded directly to the need in question.

These reductions left 15 students remaining in the subsample. The following comments made by district staff lend further support for a finding in this area:

- Regarding one student's progress in reading, a teacher reported, "Reading has not improved in a year. We can't find a motivator." However, the IEP team had not reconvened as required.
- When asked about a particular student's goals in the areas of language arts, mathematics, and written expression (which were not specified in the IEP), a special educator stated the goals were the same as the state standards. The teacher explained, "If they met the state standard, there'd be nothing to teach the rest of the year."
- Several comments from various staff pointed to confusion over the provision of supplementary aids & services:
 - "You can't tell from an IEP who gets para support. We don't write it in because it locks you in with scheduling."

- A general education teacher had suggested having one or more students work with a paraeducator in the regular classroom. A special educator responded that “they would talk about it.” However, the paraeducator was never provided. The teacher stated, “I haven’t seen (a paraeducator), so we do the best we can.”
- One staff member stated that any assessment accommodations listed in the IEP also apply to classroom instruction. He/she explained that classroom accommodations do not need to be specified in these cases.
- WDE staff learned that students with disabilities in at least one school are grouped into classes according to the paraeducator’s schedule. When asked if students might demonstrate improved progress if paraeducator’s services were not so heavily taxed in these classes, a teacher responded, “Yes I do. I feel it very strongly, and I have expressed it.”
- After stating that a student was not making adequate progress, WDE staff asked about reconvening to address the problem. A district staff member proffered, “I bet we will, but it’s up to (another IEP team member) to call it.”
- A service provider recalled the IEP team’s “concerns” about a student’s reading skills. However, special education reading services were not included in the IEP because the student didn’t quite meet the discrepancy point threshold. The student continues to struggle with reading.
- Although one teacher believed one student’s progress was poor, he/she stated, “We’re in communication without a lot of formal meetings.” The IEP team had not reconvened, nor was the IEP amended.
- For a student with definite behavior needs, a teacher stated, “(he/she) would benefit from counseling, but this hasn’t happened yet.”
- Some general educators mentioned that they are not able to attend IEP team meetings due to scheduling conflicts.
- When asked about the lack of behavior goals for a particular student (one for whom behavior was marked under the “Special Factors” in the IEP), a service provider mentioned that behavior goals were not necessary since the student’s challenging behaviors were “new.” However, the IEP in question was approximately six months old at the time of the interview.
- A teacher stated that the team would not reconvene “unless (student) really tanks. We would probably do something if (he/she) tanks.” According to current grade reports, the student is failing 3 core classes.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in SCSD # 9 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. Procedural Compliance File Review

Each member of the WDE monitoring team had the responsibility of conducting a procedural compliance check on each file reviewed during the on-site visit. In sum, 42 files were included in this review. In Appendix A of this report, these 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 Sublette #9. 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. A total of 88 surveys were mailed, and 18 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (20.45%). In Appendix B of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

File Review	Number of files reviewed	Percent of files compliant
B. Most Recent Evaluation / Reevaluation		
B1. The file contains a current evaluation	45	97.78 %
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))	45	93.33 %
B5. Prior written notice includes a description of the action the public agency is proposing or refusing. (300.503(b)(1))	45	97.78 %
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))	45	86.67 %
B19. As part of the initial evaluation/reevaluation, the IEP team reviewed current classroom based, local or state assessments. (300.305(a)(1)(ii))	45	* 84.44 %
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))	45	93.33 %
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))	45	91.11 %
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))	45	82.22 %
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))	45	97.78 %
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))	45	97.78 %
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.	45	82.22 %
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))	45	93.33 %
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))	45	82.22 %

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))	45	57.78 %
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	45	95.56 %
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))	45	93.33 %
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))	45	93.33 %
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))	45	97.78 %
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))	45	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))	45	100.00 %
G. ESY		
G1. The file contains a parent notice that ESY services will be considered	45	22.22 %

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Results
Sublette County School District #9**

Total Number of Parents who were Mailed a Survey: 88

Total Respondents: 18

Response Rate: 20.45%

	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.	21%	0%	7%	7%	21%	43%	71%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	7%	0%	0%	7%	14%	71%	92%
3. My child has educational needs that have not been addressed by the school.	64%	14%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	0%	7%	0%	21%	36%	36%	93%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.	0%	7%	0%	21%	21%	50%	92%

	Yes	No	Don't Know
6. Does your child use assistive technology (AT) devices at school? Note: assistive technology devices are items/equipment used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. 6a. If no, do you think he/she would make more progress if he/she used these devices at school? See next page for responses. 6b. If yes, are the amount/type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child? See next page for responses.	14%	57%	29%
7. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her educational needs and improve your child's progress in school? 7a. If yes, what could the school be doing? See next page for responses.	25%	58%	17%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree	Agree, Strongly Agree, Very Strongly Agree	State results (% who agreed)
8. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	8%	0%	23%	23%	8%	38%	69%	74%
9. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.	0%	0%	0%	8%	8%	84%	100%	90%
10. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	0%	0%	0%	0%	38%	62%	100%	91%
11. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	0%	0%	0%	8%	31%	61%	100%	89%
12. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	0%	0%	8%	23%	31%	38%	92%	84%

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

[See next page for responses.](#)

Open-Ended Comments
Sublette County School District #9

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

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

- No
- Not at this time.
- Only if the devices would increase language.
- Abilities
- No

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

- I believe so.

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

7a. If yes, what could the school be doing?

- Build a new school. The specific needs kids are in a modular away from the school. They must be out in the weather (can be 20 below) to do anything in the main building.

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

- I am very pleased with my child's progress and positive success he is having at this time. He has improved so much by going to summer school at the start of this year.
- I feel very fortunate to have the help we have in our school. This school has been very supportive over the years helping our family with special needs.
- Overall I'm satisfied with all the special programs they have for kids now days to help them out and get them ready for the real world. Thanks for all the teachers that help my child at Sublette School District #9.
- The school has great help with [REDACTED] t is much appreciated.

Parent Survey Demographics
Sublette County School District #9

Percent of parent respondents who said their child is:

Ethnicity	N	%
White	14	93%
Hispanic	1	7%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Other Health Impaired	2	13%
Learning Disability	6	40%
Speech/Language Disability	7	47%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten	1	7%
Grades 1-6	9	61%
Grades 7-8	3	20%
Grades 9-11	2	14%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	13	87%
Resource Room	1	7%
Separate Classroom	1	7%