



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

BIG HORN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #3

October 31 – November 2, 2011

**Special Programs Division
320 West Main Street
Riverton, WY 82501
edu.wyoming.gov**

**Wyoming Department of Education
Cindy Hill, Superintendent of Public Instruction**

Wyoming Department of Education Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Report

Big Horn County School District #3

School Year: 2011 – 2012

Date of On-Site Review: October 31 – November 2, 2011

Introduction

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Regulations include the following provision: *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 [34 C.F.R. §300.600].*

Process

A. Performance Indicator Selection

Consistent with the requirements established in 34 C.F.R §§300.600 through 300.604, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) focuses on those elements of information and data that most directly relate to or influence student performance, educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities. To assist the WDE in its fulfillment of these requirements, the Department solicited input from its General Supervision Stakeholder Group¹ during the fall of 2011. The Stakeholder Group assisted in setting the priority indicators and scoring system to be used in determining which districts would be selected for on-site monitoring.

As stated previously, IDEA places a strong emphasis on positive educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities ages three through 21. This emphasis greatly influenced the selection of three key indicators of student performance from the State 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.

With input from the stakeholder group, the WDE created a single indicator for this year's district selection mechanism: PAWS proficiency rates for students in grades 7 and 8. Specifically, the Department calculated the change (positive or negative) in regular PAWS proficiency rates for these grades in reading and mathematics from 2008 to 2011 for students with disabilities. We did this to get a measure of districts' success in

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

improving academic results for students in these grades over a four-year period. Those districts with the largest declines in proficiency rates (from 2008 to 2011) were most likely to be selected for on-site CIFM visits (along with one district selected at random).

B. Individual District Selection

To improve its district selection process, the WDE has divided the state’s 48 school districts 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

Big Horn County School District #3 (BHCS D #3) is considered a small school district and reported a special education population of 104 students on its 2011 WDE-427 report. Thus, the district’s 2010 – 2011 special education data were ranked against data from all other small districts for the same time period. Districts with the lowest scores in each population group were selected for an on-site monitoring (see below, along with overall state rates for comparison). Districts who received on-site monitoring visits during the 2010 – 2011 school year were excluded from consideration for on-site monitoring this year in order to give those districts adequate time to implement their Corrective Action Plans:

Measurement	Big Horn 3	State (minus Big Horn 3)
<i>Number students on July 2011 427 File</i>	104	15,362
A. Regular Math proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2011	9.09%	30.50%
B. Regular Reading proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2011	0.00%	29.88%
C. Sum of A and B	9.09%	60.38%
D. Regular Math proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2008	10.00%	32.09%
E. Regular Reading proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2008	20.00%	27.31%
F. Sum of D and E	30.00%	59.39%
G. Difference Score: C minus F	-0.2091	0.0099

In terms of the statewide proficiency rate variables that are included in the selection formula, Big Horn #3's data do not compare favorably to the state overall. In total, the district's regular statewide assessment proficiency rates for students with disabilities in reading and math decreased by almost 21% from the 2008 administration to the 2011 administration. The decrease is most notable in the area of reading, in which 0% of the district's 7th and 8th graders scored 'Proficient' or 'Advanced' on the regular 2011 PAWS reading test. In contrast, 20% of the students with disabilities in Big Horn #3's 7th and 8th grade classes demonstrated proficiency in this content area during the 2008 PAWS administration. When the WDE compared this statewide assessment data with other districts in this population group, Big Horn #3's total score was the lowest of eligible districts in the "small" cohort. As such, the district was selected for an onsite visit from the Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring team.

It should be noted that the district's performance on these measures is not conclusive evidence of special education 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. In short, suggestive data alone do not result in a finding: noncompliance can only be confirmed through the WDE's CIFM system if multiple pieces of objective information point to the same conclusion.

Focused Monitoring Conditions for Big Horn County School District #3

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed Big Horn #3 data from a variety of sources including the WDE-425 and WDE-427 data collections, assessment data (PAWS and PAWS-ALT), stable and risk-based self-assessment data, and discipline data from the WDE-636. In its review of data, the WDE focused on those pieces of information that are most closely related to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. This led the WDE to create three hypotheses related to the district's provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment:

1. **FAPE – Educational Benefit** This hypothesis was developed due to the district's comparatively low PAWS proficiency rates for students with disabilities at secondary grades.
2. **FAPE – Social, Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services** This hypothesis was generated due to the district's relatively high suspension rates for students with disabilities as compared to the district's non-IEP students and the state's overall rates.
3. **FAPE – Low Incidence Disabilities** This hypothesis was selected for review in all districts receiving CIFM visits during the 2011 – 2012 school year due to troubling statewide outcomes data for students in particular disability categories.

Details regarding the development of each hypothesis 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 hypotheses chosen for on-site focused monitoring, the WDE also conducted a parent survey in the district during a four-week window that included the dates of the on-site monitoring visit. Results of the parent survey are included with this report as Appendix A.

Results of On-Site Monitoring for Big Horn County School District #3

The WDE monitored these areas on-site through a focused file review and staff interviews. Each area begins with a description of the data that prompted the hypothesis, a summary of evidence gathered in the district, and the WDE's compliance determination with findings of noncompliance if applicable.

Area 1: FAPE – Educational Benefit

A. Data

In FFY 2010, Big Horn #3's statewide assessment proficiency rates for students with disabilities were lower than the state's overall rates²—with the exception of elementary reading and math (which were comparable to state rates)³. In its review of these data, the WDE identified 39 students who scored below 'Proficient' on either reading or math during their most recent test (whether 2010 or 2011). Notably, over two-thirds of these 39 students were enrolled in grades 6, 7, 8, or 11. The WDE hypothesized that some of these students may have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

B. Methodology

1. File Review

Using the 39 students described above as its purposeful sample, the WDE began its exploration of this hypothesis by reviewing these students' special education files and cumulative records. Through the file review process, sixteen students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

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

This reduction left 23 students remaining in the sample. Each of these 23 files exhibited one or more of the following violations of federal special education regulations, which prompted the WDE to further examine these student situations:

² The Big Horn #3 PAWS reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities at the middle school level was 8.33% during FFY 2010; the comparable state rate was 32.14%. In mathematics, the district's rate was 16.67% vs. 32.78% for the state overall. High school proficiency rates were lower than state rates for both reading and math, but the rates are not included here due to the low number of high school students who took the 2011 PAWS.

³ The Big Horn #3 PAWS reading proficiency rate for students with disabilities at the elementary reading level was 44.83% during FFY 2010; the comparable state rate was 44.76%. In mathematics, the district's rate was 58.62% vs. 59.2% for the state overall.

- 9 of the 23 files contained a current IEP that did not incorporate all of the student needs identified through the teams' evaluation reports [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1), 300.324(a)(1 – 2)].
- 6 of the 23 contained a current IEP that did not contain annual goals addressing each area of need as described in the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(2)(i)]
- 17 of the 23 files contained a current IEP that included one or more annual goals that were not measurable [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)(i)].
- 7 of the 23 students' current IEP included a package of services that did not appear to enable the student to advance appropriately toward meeting his/her annual goals [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(4)].
- 10 of the 23 students' progress reporting information was not clearly documented in the IEP [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)].
- 17 of 23 students' were not making adequate or expected progress in each goal area [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(i)]
- 2 of 23 students' IEP teams did not reconvene, nor was an amendment completed due to a lack of progress [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)]
- 5 of 23 files contained annual goals which had not changed meaningfully from year to year [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)]
- 5 of 23 showed evidence that some IEP team member's educational concerns—including those of parents— had not been addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.320-321]
- 8 of the 23 students had grades of 'D' or 'F' in at least one core academic course [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1 – 2), 300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)].
- 2 of 23 student's records showed poor attendance history [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(1-2), 34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)]]
- 4 of the 23 student's records showed three or more behavior incidence during the current school year [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)]

2. Interviews

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

- For eight of the students, district personnel 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 five 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 who appeared to be lacking an annual goal in an area of identified need, district personnel were able to demonstrate how the student's needs in this particular area were being addressed through existing IEP goals.

This reduction left nine students remaining in the subsample. The following comments are among those made by district personnel, which lend further support for a finding in this area:

- For several students whose files documented a need for specially designed instruction in mathematics, district staff verified that some students are not currently receiving services in the area of math instruction due to scheduling conflicts/difficulties. Scheduling difficulties were also mentioned as a limitation to providing certain students with needed services in reading.
- Regarding the documented need for reading services, district staff members informed the WDE team that direct instruction in reading at the high school level does not occur because of the need for students to acquire credits and meet graduation requirements.
- In the cases of some students with language deficits, district personnel reported that services are not being provided—even though their respective IEPs acknowledge that language services are an area in which these students require instruction or related services.
- According to district staff, specially designed instruction is being delivered to some students by paraprofessional staff in lieu of direct instruction from highly qualified personnel in the area(s) of need.
- For a particular student with health issues, poor attendance, difficulty with work completion and failing grades, the IEP team failed to reconvene to address his/her lack of progress.
- For one student, personnel commented they felt strongly that the student may not have had a comprehensive evaluation given certain behaviors and other traits.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in BHCS #3 are not always provided in accordance with the FAPE requirements established in 34 C.F.R. §§300.101, 300.320, and 300.324. The district will be required to address this substantive finding and violations of the related requirements listed under section B1 above. Correction requires the development and implementation of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

Area 2: FAPE – Social, Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services

A. Data

Information from the FFY 2009⁴ WDE-636 report indicated that Big Horn #3 suspended its students with disabilities at a much higher rate than the state overall. Specifically, the district suspended 25.71% of its students with disabilities for at least one day during that year, while Wyoming's comparable suspension rate was only 8.45%. The WDE also noted eight students who had been suspended for at least one day *and* were among the group of students described in Area 1 who had not demonstrated proficiency in one or both PAWS subtests. Of these eight students, the WDE also determined that only two were receiving Counseling (CS), Psychological Services (PS), and/or Social Work (SW) services (as reported in the 2011 WDE-427). The WDE hypothesized that one or more of these eight 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.

⁴ FFY 2010 WDE-636 data were not available to the Special Programs Division at the time of the district data review in the fall of 2011.

B. Methodology

1. File Review

Using the eight students described above as its purposeful sample, the WDE reviewed these students' special education files and cumulative records as the first step in its exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, two of the students were removed from the sample when the WDE determined that both students' IEPs were reasonably calculated to address their behavior needs.

However, each of the six files remaining in this sample exhibited one or more of the following violations of federal special education regulations, prompting the WDE to further examine these student situations:

- 4 of the 6 files did not have an evaluation that was conducted in a comprehensive manner so that social, emotional, or behavior related needs could be identified [34 C.F.R. §§300.301(c)(2)(ii), 300.304(b)(1)(ii), 300.304(b)(3), 300.304(c)(4), 300.304(c)(6), 300.305(a-d)].
- 5 of the 6 files mentioned behavioral issues as a concern, but the team did not conduct a functional behavior assessment, or FBA [34 C.F.R. §§300.304(b)(3), 300.304(c)(4), 300.304(c)(6)].
- 3 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that did not incorporate all of the student needs identified through the teams' evaluation reports [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1), 300.324(a)(1 – 2)].
- 4 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that did not contain annual goals addressing one or more area(s) of need described in the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance section of the program [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(2)(i)].
- 5 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that included one or more annual goals that were not measurable [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)(i)].
- 2 of the 6 files contained a current IEP that did not provide an appropriate package of services to reasonably enable the student to meet the annual goals [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(4)].
- 2 of 6 files students' progress reporting information was not clearly documented in the IEP [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)].
- According to progress reporting information in the files, 3 of the 6 students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. Only one of the three students' IEP teams had addressed his/her lack of adequate progress by reconvening or amending the program while the other two students' teams had not [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- 2 of 6 files contained annual goals which had not changed meaningfully from year to year [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)].
- For 2 of the 6 students, there was evidence that some IEP team members' concerns—including those of parents—had not been addressed adequately [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].
- 2 of these 6 students (both of whom were enrolled in secondary grades) had grades of 'D' or 'F' in at least one core academic course; response from the IEP team was unclear in both cases [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1 – 2), 300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)].
- 2 of the 6 students' records reflected a poor attendance history; response from the IEP team was unclear in both cases [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)].

- 2 of the 6 students' records documented the occurrence of three or more behavior incidents during the 2010 – 2011 school year [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)].

3. Interviews

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these eight specific students and their potential need for social, emotional, and/or behavioral services. Through the interview process, six students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Three of these students were in fact receiving appropriate social, emotional, and/or behavioral services and supports (some outside of the school setting).
- For two students, district personnel were able to provide compelling evidence that these students' needs were being adequately addressed through special education and related services without the provision of CS, PS, or SW services. Both of these students were shown to be making adequate/expected progress.
- One student had counseling services added to his/her IEP during the week of the WDE's on-site visit in Greybull.

These reductions left two students remaining in the subsample. The following comments made by district staff members during interviews lend support for a finding of noncompliance in this area:

Student 1:

- District staff members confirmed that this student does not receive social, emotional, or behavioral supports or services. However, he/she exhibits inappropriate behaviors that interfere with peer and adult relationships in school.
- The student does not have a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), yet reported that the student's negative behaviors could be mitigated by such an approach.

Student 2:

- District staff members confirmed that this student's behavior impedes his/her learning at school; yet he/she does not receive social, emotional, or behavioral supports or services.
- District personnel reported that he/she has great difficulty attending to specific tasks during the school day. As a result, he/she is struggling both academically and behaviorally.
- The WDE learned that district staff members feel they lack adequate evaluation information regarding the student's social, emotional, and/or behavioral performance. A Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) has not been conducted, and district personnel stated that he/she may need an annual goal addressing behavior.

C. Finding

The WDE finds BHCS #3 systemically compliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to Social Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district is not required to address this area in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

However, for the two individual students discussed under section B2 above, Big Horn #3 must take action on behalf of these students. The students' WISER ID numbers are listed on the cover letter of this report. For both of them, the district must take action to correct the specific areas of concern listed. The WDE requires that the district reconvene the students' IEP teams within 45 business days of the date of this letter. Both IEP teams must consider the listed areas of concern in order to ensure the provision of FAPE in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.101. If these IEP teams have already met and addressed these students' potential need for social, emotional, and/or behavioral supports and services, please notify the Department as soon as possible. In any case, the WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the students' IEPs.

Area 3: FAPE – Low Incidence Disabilities

A. Data

During its annual statewide data review, the WDE noted that students in particular “low incidence” disability categories appeared to be disproportionately represented in negative outcomes data reports. In particular, the data showed that no more than 2.5% of students with disabilities placed in Regular Education (RE) environments carried an eligibility label of Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Hearing Impairment (HI), Multiple Disabilities (MU), or Visual Impairment (VI). Students in these categories also appeared to be over-represented among students with disabilities who dropped out of school⁵ during FFY 2010. The WDE decided to explore the provision of FAPE to students in these categories on each of the 2011 – 2012 on-site CIFM visits.

B. Methodology

1. File Review

In planning the visit, the WDE crafted a purposeful sample comprised of all students in Big Horn #3 who have a reported disability code of BI or MU (the district reported no HI or VI students). After arriving in Greybull, the WDE monitoring team reviewed these four students' special education files as the first step in the team's exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, three students were removed from the sample:

- Two students recently moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student's IEP appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit (and he/she was making adequate/expected progress).

This reduction left one student remaining in the sample. This remaining file exhibited the following violations of federal special education regulations, prompting the WDE to further examine this student's situations:

⁵ During the 2010 – 2011 school year, Wyoming had 537 students in these disability categories in its schools: 83 BI, 179 HI, 211 MU, and 64 VI. This represents 3.46% of the total population of students with disabilities in the state. In FFY 2010, 2 BI students, 1 HI students, 2 MU students, and 0 VI students dropped out of school (exit code 'DO'). During this same school year, only 3 BI students, 7 HI students, 0 MU students, and 2 VI students graduated (exit code 'GD').

- The file included evidence that the students' evaluations were not conducted in a comprehensive manner so that all relevant educational needs could be identified [34 C.F.R. §300.304(b – c)].
- The applicable Prior Written Notice does not document why additional assessments were determined to be unnecessary at the time of the student's most recent three year reevaluation [34 C.F.R. §§300.303(b)(2), 300.305 (a)(2)(i)(B)].
- The file contained a current IEP that did not incorporate all of the student needs identified through the teams' evaluation reports [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1), 300.324(a)(1 – 2)].
- The file contained a current IEP that did not contain annual goals addressing an area of need described in the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance section of the program [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(2)(i)].
- The file contained a current IEP that included one or more annual goals that were not measurable [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)(i)].
- The student's progress reporting information was not clearly documented in the IEP [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(3)].
- According to progress reporting information available in the file, the student was not making adequate or expected progress in one or more annual goal areas. The WDE found no evidence that the IEP team reconvened or completed an amendment to address the lack of progress [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- The student's file had one or more IEP goals that had not changed meaningfully from the previous IEP to the current IEP [34 C.F.R. §300.320(b)(1)].
- The file contained evidence that some IEP team members' concerns—including those of parents—had not been adequately addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].

3. Interviews

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed district special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding this specific student. Through the interview process, the WDE found additional evidence to support a finding of FAPE noncompliance in this student's case. The unmet needs for this student center on the provision of necessary services and supports for his/her communication needs. The WDE learned that the district had acquired an augmentative communication device for the student, but it was not being utilized consistently due to the likelihood of the student's transfer out of Big Horn #3. The student continued to make inadequate progress in his/her communication skills, partially due to the school's inconsistency in providing this necessary support and services.

C. Finding

The WDE finds BHCS D #3 systemically compliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – Low Incidence Disabilities was not substantiated through on-site file reviews and interviews with district staff. The district is not required to address this area in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

However, for the individual student discussed under section B2 above, Big Horn #3 must take action on behalf of the students. His/her WISER ID number is listed on the cover letter of this report, and the district must take action to correct the specific area of concern listed. The WDE requires that the district reconvene the student's IEP team within 45 business days of the date of this letter. The teams must consider the listed areas of concern in order to ensure the provision of FAPE in accordance with 34 C.F.R.

§§300.101 and 300.105. If the IEP team has already met and addressed these areas, please notify the Department as soon as possible. In any case, the WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the student's IEP.

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 Big Horn #3. 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 77 surveys, and 16 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (20.78%). In Appendix A of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Results for:
Big Horn County School District #3**

Total Respondents: 16

Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 77

Returned due to invalid address: 0

Response Rate: 20.78%

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. At Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, we talk about whether my child needs special education services during the summer or other times when school is not in session.	0%	0%	12%	38%	50%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	0%	0%	0%	19%	81%
3. My child's school addresses my child's educational needs.	0%	0%	6%	13%	81%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	0%	7%	0%	20%	73%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after school.	0%	0%	6%	25%	69%

6. Could your child's school be doing more to address his/her academic needs and improve your child's progress in school? 6a. If yes, what could the school be doing? <i>See following page for parent comments</i>	Yes 6%	No 63%	Don't Know 31%
7. Does your child receive any social, emotional, or behavioral services at school? 7a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? 7b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? <i>See following page for parent comments</i>	Yes 6%	No 63%	Don't Know 1%

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
8. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	0%	13%	6%	50%	31%
9. My child's teachers are available to speak with me.	0%	0%	0%	12%	88%
10. Teachers and administrators treat me as an equal partner when we are planning my child's program.	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%
11. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	0%	6%	6%	25%	63%
12. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	0%	6%	0%	31%	63%

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

See following page for parent comments

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Results
Open-Ended Comments
Big Horn County School District #3**

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

6a. If yes, what could the school be doing?

- I'm not aware of what options are available that are not being used to help my child.
- They are doing an amazing job!
- Addressing her social emotional needs so that she can concentrate more on her school work.

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

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

- No
- I know the school tested and diagnosed _____ with emotional stress disorder. However, I don't think anything was done with it. I believe she would be more productive if she received these services.
- Very little. And yes, I think she would be more successful in school if she got that service. I think all students could benefit from it.
- No
- No - NA for her
- I think our school system goes above and beyond with my child. We all work together from the superintendent, spec. ed director, his staff, teaching staff, our daughter and ourselves. Very happy with the job they do.
- No

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

- The school system has gone above my expectations. The entire school staff has been "there" from day one! I'm extremely satisfied with the aid that has been given my granddaughter.
- Yes
- Yes, we see it has made a major improvement in what our child does.
- Very appropriate. There are many opportunities available to practice social skills that she needs to work on.
- Yes. They have done a lot of work with him and have helped to bring him out of his "shell" and be more social.

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

- My granddaughter transferred from _____ to the Greybull HS in _____. She has received help in ALL areas of her learning disabilities.
- There is a difficult transition between middle school and high school for SE students. I don't believe the students are prepared for the change in teaching/learning styles.
- I am very impressed with the school system. _____ has done so much in helping our child and she is showing great gains in all areas. She not only loves school now, but loves her accomplishments and only wants to keep getting better. Thanks!
- OT is doing a wonderful job in helping my child. All SpEd personnel are fantastic with my child.
- This school has done wonders with my son. He is starting to read, wants to read, he tries new things and this year he actually enjoys school.
- My child only requires speech. I'm not sure if the classroom teachers have any active role in helping speech progress in the classroom. It seems like if not, once a week practicing for 1/2 hour may not be enough to influence speech pattern changes. We work on it at home as much as possible.
- Hats off to the Greybull School System!!
- No

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring
Parent Survey Demographics for:
Big Horn County School District #3**

Gender	N	%
Female	6	50%
Male	6	50%

Ethnicity	N	%
Hispanic	2	17%
White	10	83%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Autism	1	8%
Cognitive Disability	1	8%
Emotional Disability	1	8%
Other Health Impairment	1	8%
Learning Disability	5	42%
Speech/Language Impairment	3	25%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Grades 6-8	3	25%
Grades 9-12	5	42%
Grades K-5	4	33%

Environment Code	N	%
Regular Environment	6	50%
Separate Classroom	6	50%