



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

SWEETWATER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #2

January 25 – 29, 2010

**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

Sweetwater County School District #2
School Year: 2009 – 2010
Date of On-Site Review: January 25 – 29, 2010

Introduction

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004), Part B, Section 300.600(a) of the Federal Regulations states: *The state must monitor the implementation of this part, enforce this part in accordance with §300.604 (a)(1) and (a)(3), (b)(2)(i) and (b)(2)(v), and (c)(2), and annually report on performance under this part. (b) The primary focus of the State's monitoring activities must be on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.*

Process

A. Performance Indicator Selection

Consistent with the requirements established in Federal Regulations §§300.600 through 300.604, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) focuses on those elements of information and data that most directly relate to or influence student performance, educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

The General Supervision Stakeholder Group¹ worked with the WDE Special Programs Unit in the fall of 2009 to set the priority indicators and scoring system to be used in determining which districts would be selected for on-site monitoring. IDEA 2004 places a strong emphasis on positive educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities ages three through 21. This factor greatly influenced the selection of three key indicators of student performance from the State's Performance Plan as priorities for the Continuous Improvement – Focused Monitoring (CIFM) process. The ultimate goal of the CIFM process is to promote systems change which will positively influence educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

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

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

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

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

B. Individual District Selection

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

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

Sweetwater County School District #2 (SCSD #2) is considered a large school district and reported a special education population of 518 students on its 2009 WDE-427 report. Thus, the district's 2008 – 2009 special education data were 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 2008 – 2009 school year were excluded from consideration for monitoring this year in order to give them adequate time to implement their Corrective Action Plans:

SPP Indicators	SCSD #2 Rate	Overall State Rate excluding SCSD #2
Ind. 2: Combined Dropout Rate	6.30%	9.23%
Ind. 3C: 3 rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	14.58%	29.88%
Ind. 3C: 8 th Gr. Math Proficiency	16.13%	26.67%
Ind. 5: Combined SC and SF rates	11.69%	10.61%

In terms of the variables that are included in the weighted formula, Sweetwater #2's data compared quite favorably to other large districts and to the state on the Indicator 2 variable. On this measurement, the district outperformed the state as a whole by approximately three percentage points. In addition, the district's performance on the Indicator 5 variable was comparable to the state rate, although the district had a slightly higher percentage of students placed in these more restrictive settings.

The district's total score was negatively affected by the two Indicator 3 variables, however. The district's 2009 PAWS proficiency rates for 3rd grade reading and 8th grade mathematics were both below the overall state rates (by approximately fifteen and ten percentage points respectively). In the end, when all variables were combined and compared to other districts in the same population group, SCSD #2's score was one of the two lowest of eligible districts. Thus it was selected for an on-site monitoring visit.

It should be noted that the district's performance on these key indicators is not direct evidence of noncompliance. After a district has been selected for on-site monitoring, the WDE then fully analyzes district data to determine potential areas of noncompliance that may account for the district's performance. For example, if a school had low PAWS proficiency rates in mathematics and low rates of regular class placement, the question of whether or not children had access to the general curriculum might be reviewed. A finding of noncompliance can only be made through the WDE's CIFM system if multiple pieces of objective information point to the same conclusion.

Focused Monitoring Conditions for Sweetwater County School District #2

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed the district's most recent and trended 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 four areas: 1) FAPE – Assistive Technology; 2) FAPE – Least Restrictive Environment; 3) FAPE – Social, Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services; and 4) FAPE – Educational Benefit.

- 1. FAPE – Assistive Technology** This hypothesis was developed due to the district's low rate of students receiving Assistive Technology devices and/or services when compared to the state rate.
- 2. FAPE – Least Restrictive Environment** This hypothesis was formulated due to the district's comparatively low percentage of students with disabilities placed in the Regular Environment.
- 3. FAPE – Social, Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services** This hypothesis was generated due to the district's relatively low number of students with disabilities receiving Counseling, Psychological Services, and Social Work services among those suspended for three or more days.
- 4. FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was developed due to the district's comparatively low 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 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. 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 Sweetwater #2

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

Area 1: FAPE – Assistive Technology

A. Citation

§300.5 Assistive technology device

Assistive Technology Device means any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, or the replacement of such a device.

§300.6 Assistive Technology Service

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

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

§300.105 Assistive technology

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

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

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

B. Evidence

1. Data

According to the July 2009 WDE-427 report submitted by the district, only one student with a disability in SCSD #2 received Assistive Technology (AT) over the course of the 2008 – 2009 school year. This number is notable when compared to the overall percentage of students receiving AT in the state's 47 other districts, which stood at approximately 5% during the same period.

2. File Review

WDE staff created a purposeful sample of students more likely than others to need AT in order to receive FAPE. This sample was composed of 41 students who were not receiving Assistive Technology according to the most recent WDE-425 and WDE-427 data. All of these students were reportedly eligible for special education under one or more of the following disability criteria: Autism (AT), Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Cognitive Disability (CD), Hearing Impairment (HI), Multiple Disabilities (MU), Orthopedic Impairment (OI), or Visual Impairment (VI). In addition, none of these students were reportedly served in the Regular Environment (RE) setting. The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might be in need of Assistive Technology devices or services in order to receive FAPE.

Once on-site in Green River, the WDE reviewed these 41 students' special education files. Through the file review process, 33 files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Thirteen student files did not demonstrate any clear need for Assistive Technology devices or services.
- Twelve students appeared to be receiving appropriate amounts and/or types of Assistive Technology services.
- Seven students recently moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student's IEP Team was currently in the process of evaluating his/her potential need for Assistive Technology.

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

- All eight files contained evaluation comments indicating the student could benefit from Assistive Technology.
- Each of the eight IEP files contained evidence of needs that may be addressed through AT, particularly with regard to physical access and/or communication needs.
- 1 of the 8 files did not contain any evidence that AT was considered at the IEP meeting.
- 1 of the 8 students had a current IEP which documented a lack of progress in one or more goal areas.
- 1 of the 8 files had IEP notes or minutes that reflected team member concerns about needs which could be addressed through AT.

3. Interviews

At the conclusion of the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed Sweetwater #2 special education staff, general education staff, and related service providers regarding the eight students' educational needs and their use of Assistive Technology. All eight students were removed from the subsample for the following reasons:

- For six of the students, district staff members were able to provide compelling evidence to demonstrate that these students were not in need of AT devices or services.

- The WDE learned that two of the students were in fact receiving assistive technology services and/or using AT devices. In both cases, district staff demonstrated that the type and amount of AT being delivered was appropriate given the students' needs.

C. Finding

The WDE does not find SCSD #2 noncompliant in this area. The WDE'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 Sweetwater #2 provide comprehensive Assistive Technology assessments for students who may need AT. Evaluation reports should be placed in student's files and AT data must be reported accurately to the State through the WDE-425 and WDE-427 submissions.

Area 2: Least Restrictive Environment

A. Citation

§ 300.114 LRE requirements.

- (a) (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 disability 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 §300.39 (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

In reviewing the district's most recent WDE-427 data, the Department noted that Sweetwater #2 appeared to have a comparatively high percentage of students placed in separate classrooms (11.46% compared to the state rate of 8.29%). In addition, the WDE noted that the district had a higher percentage of students in Resource Room (RR) placements than the state as a whole (34% in Sweetwater #2 vs. 12% statewide).

The representation of students with disabilities in restrictive settings was particularly notable among those with certain primary disability labels. For example, 22% of Sweetwater #2's LD students were placed in separate classrooms compared to the state rate of 12%. Additionally, 32% of the district's students with Speech Language (SL) disabilities were placed in RR settings, while only 17% of these students were similarly placed statewide. The WDE hypothesized that some Sweetwater #2 students identified as having Learning Disabilities, Speech/Language Disabilities, or Emotional Disabilities could be successfully educated in less restrictive environments with the use of supplementary aids and services.

2. File Review

In preparation for the visit, the WDE created a purposeful sample of 36 students, reportedly identified in the LD, SL, and ED categories. These students were reported as receiving special education and related services in either separate classroom or resource room settings.

Once on-site in Green River, the WDE reviewed these 36 students' special education files in order to find out more about these IEP teams' rationale for each student's removal from the general education environment. Through the file review process, ten students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Four students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- Two of the students' IEPs contained an appropriate justification for their removal from general education settings.
- Two of the students graduated in the spring of 2009.
- One student returned to the regular education program after being found no longer eligible for special education.
- One of the students dropped out of school.

26 files remained in the sample following the file review, and one or more of the following characteristics kept them in the subsample for further examination:

- 25 out of 26 files contained an inadequate or unclear rationale for the student's removal from the regular education environment.
- 24 of the 26 files contained no evidence that the IEP teams had considered a less restrictive environment for the students in question.
- For 9 of the 26 students, challenging behavior appeared to have been a factor in the placement decision. Of these 9 student files, 7 did not contain a functional behavior assessment (FBA), nor did they contain a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP).
- 6 of the 26 student files described a lack of progress on one or more of the students' IEP goals.
- For 3 of the 26 students, the WDE could not determine their levels of progress in the current setting due to unclear progress reports.
- 2 of 26 files indicated that the students' communication difficulties were a factor in the placement decision. It was unclear from these two files if/how the IEP teams had attempted the use of supplementary aids and services in regular education environments prior to placing the student in a more restrictive setting.

3. Interviews

After the file reviews were completed, WDE team members interviewed special education teachers, support staff, and related service providers regarding the learning environments for these 26 students. Through the interview process, seventeen additional files were removed from the sample for the following reasons when Sweetwater #2 staff provided compelling evidence to explain why these IEPs could not be implemented in less restrictive environments even with the provision of supplementary aids and services.

For the nine remaining students, however, the following comments are among those shared by district staff members during interviews, which lend further support for a finding in this area:

- When asked to identify barriers to a particular student's placement in general education classrooms for certain services, a general educator stated, "[Student name] did well in this class. [He/she] could be in general education; it is a matter of motivation."
- While discussing another student's placement, a district staff member remarked, "If motivators were there with the right accommodations, [he/she] could do it" (be placed in a less restrictive setting).

- When asked whether or not a less restrictive setting had been considered in a certain student's case, a service provider responded, "The recommendation came from [student's previous school], and that is why." The service provider was not sure if placement had been reconsidered at the student's most recent IEP meeting.
- When asked whether or not a particular student might succeed in general education settings with supplementary aids and services, a district staff member stated, "[Student name] has been 'long-term enabled'; [he/she] is very capable." The staff member added, "[He/She] doesn't need us. [He/She] acts out in the resource room but not in the regular education setting."
- When asked whether the use of supplementary aids and services might enable a student to spend more time in the general education classroom, a teacher responded, "[He/She] is close to doing regular education work but would need a paraprofessional. We will keep [him/her] in pull-out this year, and move [him/her] out next year when student moves out to [grade level at next school building]." It was not clear why the support of a paraprofessional was ruled out in this student's case for the current school year.
- For a student with unclear accommodations and services, no behavior plan, and with recognized behavior issues: A staff member commented, "[Student name] has the ability to be in a general education class, but being on-task is more of the issue."

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in SCSD # 2 are not always provided in accordance with the LRE requirements established in §§300.114 through 300.117. 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: FAPE – Social, Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services

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*

§300.320 Definition of Individualized Education Program

(a) General. As used in this part, the term individualized education program or IEP means a written statement for each child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in a meeting in accordance with 300.320 through 300.324, and that must include—

(4) A statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services, based on peer-reviewed research to the extent practicable, to be provided to the child, or on behalf of the child, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided to enable the child—

- (i) To advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals;*
- (ii) To be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum in accordance with paragraph (a)(1) of this section, and to participate in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities; and*
- (iii) To be educated and participate with other children with disabilities and nondisabled children in the activities described in this section;*

B. Evidence

1. Data

Information from the most recent WDE-636 report indicated that 14% of the students with disabilities in Sweetwater #2 had at least one suspension incident during the 2008 – 2009 school year. Digging deeper into the data, the WDE learned that 31 students with disabilities were suspended for three or more days during the same school year. When the WDE cross-referenced the WDE-636 with the WDE-427 report, the Department discovered that only ten of these 31 students were receiving Counseling (CS), Psychological Services (PS), and/or Social Work (SW) services as components of their current IEP. The WDE hypothesized that some of the 21 students might have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit due to the district's apparent failure to provide necessary related services.

2. File Review

Using the 21 students described above as its purposeful sample, the WDE reviewed these students' special education files as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, ten students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Seven students' IEPs appeared to have adequate behavior supports and/or services in place.
- Two students recently moved or transferred out of district.
- One student's IEP team was in the midst of determining the student's social/emotional and/or behavioral needs through the assessment process.

This reduction left eleven 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' potential need for social, emotional, and/or behavioral services:

- All eleven students' MDE reports identified needs in social, emotional and/or behavioral areas.
- 4 of the 11 files contained an IEP that did not include any mention of the students' social, emotional, and/or behavioral needs (despite information found in the MDE reports).
- 10 of 11 IEPs did not contain annual goals addressing social, emotional and/or behavioral needs, nor did these ten IEPs contain relevant services to address educational needs in these areas.
- 1 of 11 files indicated that the goals related to social, emotional, and/or behavioral needs are not measurable.
- 9 of 11 files contained no evidence of a Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA).
- 8 of 11 files contained no evidence of a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP).
- 1 of 11 students' current IEPs contained documentation indicating that supplementary aids and services were to be provided on an "as needed" or other unclear basis.
- 8 of 11 files documented each student's lack of progress in one or more goal areas; none of these 8 files contained evidence that the IEP teams had reconvened or amended the students' programs to address the lack of progress.
- 7 of 11 files contained documentation in IEP notes and/or minutes that reflect at least one team member's concerns about social, emotional, and/or behavioral needs not adequately addressed in IEP.
- In 9 of the 11 cases, the students had at least one 'D' or 'F' in a core academic subject according to the most recent grade report.
- 7 of 11 students' attendance records revealed frequent or long absences from school.
- 5 of 11 students' records documented frequent disciplinary incidents and/or behavioral difficulties.

3. Interviews

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these eleven specific students and their potential need for social, emotional, and/or behavioral

services. Through the interview process, seven additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For six 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. Furthermore, each of these students was shown to be making adequate/expected progress.
- The WDE learned that the one student's IEP team had just met and are implementing a new IEP.

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

- While discussing a particular student's lack of progress and the effect of the student's negative behavior, a district staff member commented, "Behavior is an ongoing thing. I don't know if the team has reconvened to talk about it."
- When asked if a student would benefit from a behavioral supports and/or services, a special educator said, "If it was totally [student name], he/she would benefit. But [another student's name] sets him/her up too."
- When asked about possible goal to track improvement in a student's [social skills] behavior, a service provider stated that the student was in need of such a goal. However, the provider was unsure of how to write a goal in this area, asking, "How do you measure progress in these kinds of behavior issues?"
- For a student who a teacher identified as needing a social skills goal (and is currently lacking one), the teacher explained, "The IEP team is not meeting until March. We haven't changed them (goals); we figured we would wait and then change them at the IEP."
- During discussion of a student's emotional needs and related services; a staff member noted, "I think he/she would benefit from counseling."
- While discussing a particular student, a staff member said, "This kid needs more support—even more than we can give [him/her]!" However the student's IEP did not include Counseling, Psychological Services, or Social Work services to address these student needs.
- For a student not doing well academically due to poor attendance over the course of the school year, a special educator commented that the IEP team is "looking to make a new goal regarding attendance" but added, "I can't change the goal until we meet."
- While discussing a student's poor school attendance, a staff member suggested, "Attendance and truancy should be part of the IEP."
- When asked if the IEP team reconvened to address the student's poor behavior, the case manager indicated, "The behavior was not that horrible, and I didn't think about it." In further discussing the student's inadequate progress, the staff member admitted, "I dropped the ball on this one."
- When asked whether counseling or social work services might help a particular student achieve adequate progress, a district staff member responded, "I would think so. If there is something we can do, that might help." The same staff member described the district's overall efforts to meet students' social/emotional and/or behavioral needs as a "weakness."
- While discussing a certain student's negative behaviors, a teacher stated, "[He/She] has just started in a new behavior program, so it's not on the IEP."

However, the student's file contained no evidence that the team had reconvened or amended any aspect of the program since the annual IEP meeting.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in SCSD # 2 are not always provided in accordance with the FAPE requirements established in §300.320. 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 4: FAPE – Educational Benefit

A. Citation

§300.101 Free appropriate public education (FAPE).

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

(c) Children advancing from grade to grade.

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

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

§300.324 Development, review, and revision of IEP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(D) The child's anticipated needs; or

(E) Other matters.

B. Evidence

1. Data

As noted above in the introduction of this report, the WDE noted that 2009 PAWS proficiency rates among students with disabilities in Sweetwater #2 were below the overall state targets for language arts and slightly below for mathematics at all school levels. Probing deeper into the data, the WDE discovered that 51 of the district's students with disabilities with a primary disability label of Other Health Impairment (HL) or Learning Disability (LD) in resource room (RR) placements at any grade level scored 'Below Proficient' on all three 2009 PAWS subtests (reading, writing, and math). The

WDE hypothesized that some of these students may have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

2. File Review

Using the 51 students described above 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, nineteen students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

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

This reduction left 32 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:

- 10 of the 32 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.
- 9 out of 32 files listed needs in the IEP which were not addressed by goals.
- 27 of the 32 files contained one or more goals that were not measurable.
- 7 out of 32 files contained a program of special education and related services that did not appear to address the student's needs and goals adequately.
- 27 out of 32 files indicated that accommodations were to be provided on an “as needed,” “as appropriate,” “at student's request,” or other similar basis, indicating an unclear commitment to the delivery of these supports and services.
- In 15 of 32 files, the students demonstrated a lack of progress in one or more goal areas; in 14 of those 15 files there was a failure to reconvene the IEP team or amend the program to address the lack of progress.
- In 19 of the 32 files, the students' levels of progress in one or more goal areas were unclear due to inconsistent or non-existent progress reporting.
- For 10 of 32 files, one or more the students' current IEP goals had not changed meaningfully from those listed in their prior IEPs.
- 8 of 32 files contained IEP notes or minutes that reflected at least one team member's concerns and that do not appear to be addressed in the IEP.
- 20 of the 32 student's records indicated that the students had a ‘D’ or an ‘F’ in one or more core academic classes (mathematics, language arts, science, or social studies).
- 6 of 32 students' records contained documentation of attendance issues involving frequent or long absences.
- 5 of 32 student files contained documentation of multiple disciplinary incidents and/or behavioral difficulties.

3. Interviews

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed district special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these 32 specific students. Through the interview process, 23 additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For twelve 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 several of these cases, the students' needs had changed since their most recent evaluation.
- 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 one student whose file documented a lack of progress, district staff were not available to interview. The WDE removed the student from the sample rather than relying on only the file review results.
- Results of interviews regarding one student were inconclusive, leading the WDE to remove the student from the sample.

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

- When discussing a student's lack of progress, a staff member confirmed the student's poor progress, stating, "[Student name] is not doing well. [He/She] is inappropriately placed." The staff member also stated that the student's IEP team had not reconvened to address the lack of progress.
- For a student who has been receiving failing grades since the first quarter of this school year, a case manager stated, "In the first four weeks I could tell, but, it [the IEP] was based on [prior school's] recommendation." When asked if the IEP team had reconvened, the case manager stated, "No." The staff member continued to say that there had been discussion at parent conferences but no changes to the IEP.
- While discussing a student whose special education teacher stated he/she failed a general education class because of difficulties in reading the tests, and who had accommodations pertaining to test taking, the teacher indicated the accommodations were not provided. When the teacher was asked if the IEP team reconvened to address the provision of accommodations, the teacher said, "No."
- For a student whose behavioral concerns were documented in his/her assessments and progress reports, a teacher verified that these negative behaviors were impacting the student's progress. The IEP team had not reconvened to address behavior or the student's lack of progress.
- When asked about a certain student who was demonstrating almost no progress and rarely attending school, a district staff member reported that the IEP team had not reconvened. Instead, the team is "waiting until the regular meeting."
- When asked how the student's poor attendance was being addressed by the team, the staff member stated, "I assume someone went to the home and talked to the family. We took it to [administrator's name]; [he/she] is responsible for attendance."
- For a student with identified social and emotional needs and no counseling goal or services, a staff member stated, "This kid should be labeled ED – you mean [he/she] is not?" "[He/She] needs counseling or social work, one on one— definitely needs counseling!"

- When asked about the lack of progress reports in a few of his/her students' files, a district staff member stated "I'm not good with the paperwork." The teacher was unable to locate recent progress reports.
- In discussing a particular student's needs, a service provider mentioned that a student's low organizational skills interfere with his/her ability to demonstrate adequate progress in school. When asked whether an annual goal focused on improving organization might be necessary, the service provider responded, "Counseling should take care of that." The student's counseling goal at the time of the monitoring visit did not address organization.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in SCSD # 2 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, 106 files were reviewed for this purpose. In Appendix A of this report, these file review results may be found. For any file review item in which the district's compliance is below 95%, the WDE requires that the district evidence correction of the noncompliance in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and conduct an additional self assessment to assure full compliance in these areas. More detailed guidance is provided on the CAP form.

B. Parent Survey Results

As part of the monitoring process, the WDE developed a Parent Survey in order to provide all parents an opportunity to give input on their children's special education experiences in Sweetwater #2. 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 423 surveys, and 91 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (21.67%). In Appendix B of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

File Review 1902000	Number of files reviewed	Percent of files compliant
C6. In the evaluation/ reevaluation, the file documents whether the child has or continues to have a disability, the present level of academic achievement and related developmental needs of the child, whether the child continues to need special education and related services and whether additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed. (300.305(a)(2))	106	98.11%
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))	106	92.45%
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))	106	97.17%
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))	106	72.64%
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.	106	94.34%
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))	106	99.06%
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))	106	76.42%
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))	106	43.40%
E30. The IEP includes documentation when periodic reports regarding progress toward meeting annual goals will be provided. (300.320(a)(3)(ii))	106	95.28%
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))	106	89.62%
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))	106	100.00%

E46. The file contains documentation that the public agency conducted a meeting to develop the initial IEP within 30 calendar days of a determination that a child with a disability was found eligible for special education and related services. (300.323(c)(1))	106	98.11%
E47. The file contains prior written notice regarding the implementation of the current IEP. (§300.503)	106	66.04%
E48. The IEP documents that all of the required participants attended the IEP meeting -- parent, special education teacher of the child, general education teacher of the child, representative of the public agency (§300.321(a))	106	94.34%
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))	106	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))	106	100.00%

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

Total respondents: 91
Total parents who were mailed a survey: 423
Returned due to invalid address: 3
Response rate: 21.67%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
1. At Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, we talk about whether my child needs special education services during the summer or other times when school is not in session.	4%	1%	12%	35%	23%	24%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	0%	1%	7%	30%	20%	43%
3. My child's educational needs are being adequately addressed by the school.	5%	2%	16%	25%	14%	36%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	4%	2%	16%	29%	26%	23%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after school.	7%	2%	13%	35%	22%	21%

6. Does your child use assistive technology (AT) devices at school? Note: assistive technology devices are items/equipment used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. 6a. If no, do you think he/she would make more progress if he/she used these devices at school? 6b. If yes, are the amount/type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child? <i>See following pages for responses</i>	Yes 9%	No 61%	Don't Know 30%
7. Are there any additional supports, services, or equipment that would enable your child to spend more time in the regular classroom? 7a. If yes, please describe? <i>See following pages for responses</i>	Yes 9%	No 52%	Don't Know 40%
8. Does your child receive any social, emotional, or behavioral 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 amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? <i>See following pages for responses</i>	Yes 43%	No 45%	Don't Know 11%
9. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her academic needs and improve your child's progress in school? 9a. If yes, what could the school be doing? <i>See following pages for responses</i>	Yes 33%	No 45%	Don't Know 22%

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
10. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	12%	6%	15%	35%	15%	17%
11. Teachers at my child's school are available to speak with me.	0%	2%	4%	31%	28%	34%
12. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	1%	3%	6%	28%	25%	36%
13. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	2%	2%	16%	29%	20%	31%
14. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	3%	6%	15%	30%	16%	29%

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

See following pages for responses

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Open-Ended Comments
Sweetwater County School District #2**

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?

- Yes, audio devices such as books on tape would be beneficial
- I don't know (x5)
- No (x12)
- We do not think she would make more progress if she used these devices at school since her disability does not require such
- I am not sure but it would have made him feel uneasy about using it
- Not needed
- I am not aware that they have any such devices for my child to use - just like a spare book for him to have one of his own so he could bring it home every night to do his homework wasn't even allowed, or looked into last year when he was struggling with a certain class. I was told they just don't have the supply & so he wasn't able to read ahead or work on homework at night that he couldn't get done in class as he has a hard time understanding... so his grades were awful & he became so discouraged... which lead to other behavior problems. I was so disappointed. So he could only do the very best he could last year - as not much extra support in getting "Extra" help, books, etc. was made. (That has been very frustrating & when I have talked to administration about it - I never hear back & nothing is ever done about it.) This year we have different teachers & staff that he is working with & things have been much better, but no extra devices are known of for his use at this time
- I do think he would make better progress with assistive technology. At my child's last meeting this fall (an IEP "revamp"), it was discussed and agreed upon to get him AT to help with writing reports and spelling. So far we haven't seen anything
- No, I don't think that would benefit my child
- No he doesn't need them at this time
- His fault though
- We were told during the IEP [REDACTED] may have a communication device but have not been updated since
- I think so if they would listen to me
- Yes- it would be very helpful
- I don't know what (AT) devices are
- The school is just now borrowing a dynovox for 1 month. However, they don't plan on buying one, and the time allotted for her to be with the speech teacher is very little, and she stays late to accommodate the schools schedule for speech

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

- I don't know
- Right now, I'm not sure. It was discussed that he would be getting some software and an available computer, but again, we haven't seen anything.
- NA
- He does not need any at this time
- The device meets her needs in the classroom, but is difficult to use outside of the classroom

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

7a. If yes, please describe?

- I wish my child's speech and language teacher was not gone so much because it causes my child to have to miss her speech and language time. The loss of assistance is prolonging her ability to properly gain the speech and language skills she needs to make progress and eventually exit out of the program
- He is receiving an extended school day to help him, as he was not getting his support services as per his original IEP
- My child needs constant one on one supervision. He has major behavioral problems and problems staying on task. I will be the first to admit that he needs a babysitter to ensure that he completes work and follows directions at school
- Teachers aide

- He needs to learn a better understanding of the value of money and counting and handling it. For instance, if I give him two, ten dollar bills to pay for something that costs three dollars, He will give the clerk both ten dollar bills to pay for it. He is mildly autistic and I'm sure in time he will learn the value of it
- Not sure, having an aid that can translate would be great to try

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

8a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services?

- No, my child has a hard time correctly pronouncing his "R's"
- I recently requested a behavioral assessment be completed for my child as one has never been done however; there is a behavioral plan on the IEP that we feel is not positive
- Yes (x4)
- No (x7)
- Peer relationship would help
- She does not require these services
- Yes I think it would have helped him
- He hasn't been able to at the 5-6th grade level as the school counselor is always too overwhelmed with others to have time for our son. He spent his free time in line one day to talk to the counselor & then after trying for 3 days when he really needed to talk to him - he gave up. Then when he had a real big issue come up with a locker partner who's belongings were being urinated on by dogs at home & it made everything smell horrible in their locker... my son started sharing with another child who quietly let him store his stuff in his locker. Girls then told on my son & the counselor got involved & didn't listen to the story from my son's side (who has sensory issues)... only from the girls who didn't like their space crowded & my son has lost faith & hope in working with his school counselor after that. I have suggested & asked several times for the teachers to make it possible for him to get that support & it hasn't been a priority... besides letting him stand in line. So we have struggled through difficult times with him. At the elementary level - Yes he received this & he grew leaps & bounds & found so much help & confidence when he had these services to go to!!! It was a huge benefit! I have been disappointed at this school level!
- NA (x2)
- Don't know
- I have outside services I don't need a social worker
- No it does not work in a school setting- I have an outside source
- Sometimes
- He is 21 years old now and be leaving school this year
- Yes - she does not receive very much

8b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child?

- Yes I do (x2)
- I don't know. I think the school needs to retest him and find out how to help him out more
- Yes, I know the counselor he sees at school is helping a lot. He has made progress with him and I see it in his behavior at home
- Yes (x10)
- Absolutely
- I wish they would get a jump start on the SVE at the beginning of the school year faster instead of waiting
- Yes, from the counseling standpoint, he is taken care of. However, none of his teachers had any clue he even had an IEP before I brought it up. And now, only his core teachers are made aware of it. There is something missing when his teachers have no knowledge of his issues. That has been ongoing since middle school in the Sweetwater County #2 schools
- No, I think that the level of interaction with his case worker is very limited and most of my son's classroom work is left to myself and sometimes an aide to deal with. He really is doing poorly in the 6th grade and even after many (over 10) visits in person to the school in the first 2 months, and email contacts with his case worker, I am very frustrated with the lack of concern for my son's lagging progress. The school would rather stand by their decision of hiring a new staff member than look at the actual progress of the students. At the end of the first week of school, all 4 of the students in my son's core "special needs" group were failing (with an F grade) in the core areas of Math, Reading and Language. I know this because the other parents were right there with me in the office to complain. How is that even possible? The school district doesn't really teach these children, they teach to pass the standard assessments. Because of this, my son continues to fall further behind
- I believe so, we just increased his counseling
- To a degree, my child's emotional disability severely retards any learning that can take place. Although he does receive counseling and a great deal of support from his caseworker, he does not receive strict enough consequences from the Dean of Students for actions that disrupt his educational path

- Yes, I feel the time spent in these services is adequate
- Yes I do, at each IEP meeting it also re-evaluated to see if it needs to be increased or decreased
- Yes they seem very appropriate and he enjoys them
- I think the services are very good
- Don't know
- This does not apply to my child
- Yes they are appropriate
- No

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

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

- After many years of our child having an IEP, we have found year after year that teachers do not follow the IEP or our recommendations. Many times numerous meetings have to take place after the yearly IEP meeting to make sure that all are on track and following the IEP. Seems that there is a lack of follow thru on the administrations part to hold teacher accountable
- Retest get to the bottom of the problem. Never test during the "Honeymoon" stage as you will not always get the right results. If he does not have what they tested for then test for something else
- The speech teacher needs to be available to make all the scheduled instruction times rather than being pulled for other secondary IEP meetings and GREA President issues.
- Act faster
- He was doing excellent until he entered Middle School. Since then I haven't had a meeting and he is failing in a couple of classes. He doesn't try as hard as he has in the past. His counselor last year helped him to learn how to play chess and he won his division, this year he has no interest in any activities. I don't know what can be done at this point
- Yes, there is always room for progress
- Communication with all of the staff. For example, my son has a terrible time being bullied because of his rather detached personality. This is especially true in PE class. For the past 4 years, his phys-ed teachers have remained uninformed of his condition, and when informed, say he should just "get over it and fit in". They don't have to be there when he comes home from school and goes to his room frustrated to tears because the other kids pick on him and the teachers see it and do nothing about it
- See above, I've really given up on getting any help for my son's education from School District #2.
- I would say - probably on #9! Everyone claims hard economical times have pinched everyone... so there isn't the \$\$, there isn't the staff, the support.... what does a family do then? I'd have to say our child is doing better this year as we were able to request a specific classroom/teacher for him - when it wasn't an option or a privileged last year (which was terribly frustrating & he fell back in a lot of areas.) So being able to select a teacher has helped make the world of difference having a teacher we know will work with us & child
- It has felt like a lot of "hitting heads against walls" when asking for help. I think just doing what is in his IEP would be very beneficial to not only my child, but others with similar issues
- I feel at this time the only thing that can be done to get my child where he needs to be academically is constant one on one schooling. He refuses to behave enough to be in any other setting where learning is taking place.
- Yes the school could make sure that every effort is done to meet the standards and that a child with special needs and all the help available should not have below a C
- I am not certain of the answer but since my child is failing almost every course I am sure there is something that needs to be done. The connection has not been made with my child
- After school tutoring smaller groups for help if they have questions about their work program should be structured to meet her needs- not expect her to conform to the teacher generated program for the group
- The classroom aides / para's have made a big difference- they could be trained a little more on modification and should be sure to read the IEP or at least the classroom and behavior parts
- The school is doing a very good job. My son is in for stuttering , etc
- Some of the classroom teachers are allowing these kids to fail. My son had a D, along with 2 other IEP students, and tried and tried to get the grade up but couldn't
- Stop putting so much effort in to the fact he might have a behavior and just teach him spelling, reading and math. [REDACTED] could read better in a private 3rd grade church school - now he's 18 and has a 1st grade reading level. You tell me
- My child was denied summer school in the summer of 2009. His psychiatrist recommended year round school but, our school doesn't have year round school. He then strongly recommended summer school, and he was denied because there weren't enough slots. He was tested as number 15 with only 10 slots offered. It set my son back in his behavior

- Listen to what I have to say
- Using the info that I supply them with instead of looking at me like I am stupid
- More one on one
- When my son was in grade school he had a teacher trained to teach autistic children and he was improving to the point of doing multiplication & division. When he transferred to middle school, they went back to coloring because they didn't have an autism teacher for him. He would've been better staying in the other school
- Well, an aid that has never taught has been teaching her. And in one class the teachers have not even observed how the material is being presented. The aide takes her out of class and she doesn't get interaction with kids.
- Be more on top of his grades

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

- As a parent I have felt overwhelmed and extremely stressed over my child's education. His IEP is overly negative with no positive feedback. I feel the more involved I become with his education the more difficult it becomes for him to succeed
- I liked my son's school is very comfortable for us and academic is perfect
- I think a school needs to do more research and find out the problem with a student. If a student has problems don't make the speech teacher take care of his melt downs there is a reason behind them. Get on the ball more. Maybe they need to retest as the first time they tested school was new to him and he loved being taken out of class for these play times (testing)
- I haven't had the opportunity to meet with anyone this year; I haven't received a phone call from any special education teachers since school started this year. I would think they would be more concerned with his failing grades
- The reason my son does as well as he does in school is mainly because of his efforts and because I have done extensive learning about his condition. Every year, I feel like it is new battles just to have his educators understand him. The school district doesn't do a very good job with special needs students past the 4th grade in Green River. Maybe they think the kids just grow out of it - but that isn't the case
- If it were not for the social need of my son, I would home school him
- I am grateful for the teacher my child has this year & many other years in the past - as some have really gone the extra mile & more, to work with him. Those years he has progressed so much!! Some of those teachers were: [REDACTED]
- If the support staff would use more time helping the kids and less time complaining about them, it would be very helpful to everyone involved
- Some of the staff at my son's school are awesome to say the very least with supporting my wishes and the needs of my child....they see the big picture. Others are less understanding to the whole story....they even go so far as enabling his behaviors on occasion. The issues with my son, now a 19 year old (in March) senior, have been in place since he was 2 1/2 years old. We as his parent have been very supportive of the school in all that that time, we only ask in return that they respect our wishes and understand that since we live with him every day and every night that we might know a little more than some of the administration want to give us credit for.
- I feel the teacher needs assistance to provide adequate instruction to students on such a broad spectrum of abilities
- I went to the web site to this online and message said could not find it
- I am very happy overall with the services my student received for her special needs
- Thank You
- I need more info about services for my child if she should become disabled from illness
- I am very happy with the services my daughter is receiving. I would like to thank all of you who have taken a valiant effort to help my child succeed
- It was talked about during his IEP for outside testing - it has taken 4.5 months to get this done
- I am pleased with my daughter's school, they have included me in every decision
- I feel the school district is really letting down the handicapped kids. I feel you people are in it only for the extra money. I'm debating if my child will continue next year at SD#1
- It would help out a lot if kids could bring books home to help with their homework. Sometimes they need them to do their work
- Does not concern me questions 10 and 12 above - he has a speech problem due to tubes being put in too late. I don't care about the money. I care about individuals being treated equally whether answering by mail or online
- I would like to meet a member of WDE when you are visiting #2
- Very satisfied with all the programs my children have received. More input on after school is over to the children's
- Monroe Middle school in Green river has helped me and my child make big leaps in her abilities to function regularly
- I only speak Spanish and had to get a translator for this form
- I believe that the school is supportive now. The funding issues make no sense to me. If we fund our children then we fund our future

- I think when a student is struggling and has a very low grade the teacher should take the time to contact parents for a plan of action
- Not at this time
- I found out that another child's mother insisted that they keep her daughter in the autistic teacher's class and that she has improved to near normal levels. This girl was the same age as my son and in my son's class in the 5th grade. If he would of stayed with that teacher I'm sure he would've advanced way beyond where he is today. He was improving at unbelievable levels at that time.
- The school has put off working on communication. They don't have enough speech therapist to spend adequate time with my daughter. and they say they can't do anything about it

Respondent Demographics Sweetwater County School District #2

Percent of parent respondents who said their child is:

Ethnicity	N	%
White	69	91%
Hispanic	6	8%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	1%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Autism	7	9%
Cognitive Disability	5	7%
Developmental Delay	3	4%
Emotional Disability	5	7%
Specific Learning Disability	24	32%
Speech/Language Impairment	10	13%
Other Health Impairment	22	29%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Kindergarten	6	8%
Grades 1-6	38	50%
Grades 7-8	13	17%
Grades 9-12	19	25%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	3	49%
Resource Room	22	29%
Separate Classroom	16	21%
Separate School	1	1%