



**Continuous Improvement  
Focused Monitoring Report  
for**

**CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1**

**December 5 – 9, 2011**

**Special Programs Division  
320 West Main Street  
Riverton, WY 82501  
[edu.wyoming.gov](http://edu.wyoming.gov)**

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

# Wyoming Department of Education Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Report

**Campbell County School District #1**

**School Year: 2011 – 2012**

**Date of On-Site Review: December 5 – December 9, 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 Group<sup>1</sup> 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 influences the annual selection of 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. The Department did this to obtain a measure of districts' success in improving academic results for students in these grades over a four-year period. Those districts with the largest declines in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Stakeholder Group is comprised of principals, special education directors, teachers, parents, advocates and superintendents from across the state.

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

Campbell County School District #1 (CCSD #1) is considered a large school district and reported a special education population of 1,325 students on its 2011 WDE-427 report. Thus, the district's 2010 – 2011 special education data were ranked against data from all other large districts for the same time period. Districts with the lowest scores 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 2010 – 2011 school year were excluded from consideration for monitoring this year in order to give them adequate time to implement their Corrective Action Plans:

Measurement	Campbell 1	State (minus Campbell 1)
<i>Number students on July 2011 427 File</i>	1,325	14,141
A. Math proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2011	29.93%	30.41%
B. Reading proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2011	25.55%	30.00%
C. Sum of A. and B.	55.47%	60.45%
D. Math proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2008	47.75%	30.85%
E. Reading proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2008	27.27%	27.26%
F. Sum of D. and E.	75.02%	58.11%
G. Difference Score: C minus F	-0.1955	0.0230

In terms of the 2011 statewide proficiency rate variables included in the selection formula, Campbell #1's data are comparable to the state overall. Campbell #1's 2011 PAWS proficiency rates were approximately 0.48% lower in mathematics and 4.5% lower in reading compared to

the 2011 statewide data. However, the district outperformed the state as a whole in mathematics at the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade levels during the 2008 PAWS administration. When taken in sum, the district's regular statewide assessment proficiency rates for middle school students with disabilities in reading and math decreased by approximately 20% from the 2008 administration to the 2011 administration. The decrease is most notable in the area of math, in which 47.75% of the district's 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders scored 'Proficient' or 'Advanced' on the regular 2008 PAWS reading test. In contrast, 29.93% of the students with disabilities in Campbell #1's 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade classes demonstrated proficiency in this content area during the 2011 PAWS administration. When the WDE compared this statewide assessment data with other districts in this population group, Campbell #1's total score was the lowest of eligible districts in the large cohort. As such, the district was selected for an onsite visit from the WDE's 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 have 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 Campbell County School District #1**

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed Campbell #1 data from a variety of sources including the WDE-425 and WDE-427 data collections, assessment data (PAWS and PAWS-ALT) from 2006 through 2011, 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 five 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 (particularly at the middle school level).
- 2. FAPE – Social, Emotional and Behavioral Supports and Services** This hypothesis was generated primarily due to the district's comparatively low number of students with disabilities receiving Counseling, Psychological Services, and/or Social Work services among those who received multiple disciplinary suspensions in the past.
- 3. Least Restrictive Environment** This hypothesis was formulated due to the district's comparatively high percentages of students with disabilities placed in restrictive settings.
- 4. Evaluation Procedures** This hypothesis was generated in response to district data showing a potential overidentification of students with disabilities under the Other Health Impairment (HL) criteria.
- 5. 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 Campbell County School District #1**

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**

While preparing for its visit to Campbell #1, the WDE team noticed some areas of concern in its detailed review of district statewide assessment data. In particular, the team noted that while elementary proficiency rates are improving in the district, proficiency rates for students with disabilities at the middle school level have declined over the past few years<sup>2</sup>. The WDE hypothesized that some of the students with disabilities who were unable to demonstrate proficiency may have IEPs that are not reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit.

#### **B. Methodology**

##### **1. File Review**

The WDE crafted a purposeful sample of 46 students with disabilities to use in its exploration of this hypothesis. All of the students in the sample scored below 'Proficient' on all three subtests (reading, writing, and mathematics) of the 2011 PAWS, were placed in 'Resource Room' settings, and were enrolled in grades 7 – 12. 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, 35 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Seventeen student files were removed from the sample by the monitoring team leader before being reviewed in order to ensure timely completion of the file review.
- Nine students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- Seven students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each was making adequate/expected progress.
- One file was not available during the time of the WDE's visit.
- One student had dropped out of school.

---

<sup>2</sup> Reading proficiency rates for students with disabilities at the elementary level increased from 34.47% in the spring of 2008 to 45.88% in 2011; mathematics proficiency rates increased from 51.99% in 2008 to 62.12% in 2011. On the other hand, middle school (grades 7 and 8) reading proficiency rates among students with disabilities decreased from 27.27% in the spring of 2008 to 25.55% in 2011; mathematics rates among the same population decreased from 47.75% in 2008 to 29.93% in 2011.

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

- 1 of the 11 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)].
- 2 of the 11 files 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)].
- 6 of the 11 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 11 students' current IEPs included a package of services that did not appear to enable the students to advance appropriately toward meeting his/her annual goals [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(4)].
- 5 of the 11 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, 6 of the 11 students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. None of these six students' IEP teams had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the programs [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- 5 of the 11 students 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)].
- For 3 of the 11 students, there was evidence that some IEP team members' concerns—including those of parents—had not been adequately addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].
- 8 of these 11 students (all eight 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 each case [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1 – 2), 300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)].
- 2 of the 11 students' records reflected a poor attendance history; response from these IEP teams was unclear [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 eleven specific students. Through the interview process, ten additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding four students who appeared to be making inadequate progress, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were now making sufficient progress and receiving educational benefit.
- For three students who appeared to have unmet educational needs, those interviewed were able to provide compelling evidence that the students' needs were in fact being adequately addressed through special education and related services.
- For one student whose IEP appeared to have unmet behavior needs, staff members were able to provide compelling evidence that the student's needs were being met.
- For one student who appeared to be making inadequate progress in the general curriculum, staff members provided documentation showing that the student is making adequate progress and is now passing the class in question.

- For one student who appeared to be lacking an annual goal in an area of identified need, district staff members were able to demonstrate how the student's need in this particular area was being addressed through an existing goal on the IEP.

These reductions left one student remaining in the subsample. The following comments are among those made by district staff, which lend further support for a finding in this area:

### **Student One**

- According to the student's progress reports from the first quarter of the 2011 – 2012 school year, his/her performance has regressed on two goals, but he/she has already met the annual goal in another area.
- District staff members commented that the team is planning to reconvene to amend the IEP to address these three goal areas, but the team had not done so at the time of the WDE's visit.

### **C. Finding**

The WDE finds CCSD #1 systemically compliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – Educational Benefit 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, Campbell #1 must take action on behalf of this student. The student's WISER ID number is listed on the cover letter of this report. The district must take action to correct the specific areas of concern listed. The WDE requires that the district reconvene the student's IEP team within 45 business days of the date of this report. The IEP team 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 the student's IEP team has already met since the WDE's visit and addressed the student's lack of progress and potential need to amend goals, please notify the Department as soon as possible. In any case, within the timeframe noted above, the WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the student's IEP.

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

### **A. Data**

Information from the most recent WDE-427 report indicated that 5.7% of Campbell #1's students with disabilities receive Counseling (CS), Psychological Services (PS), and/or Social Work (SW) as related services. The district's rate was notably lower than the comparable state rate, which was 20.4% during the same time period. When cross-analyzing WDE-427 and FFY 2009 WDE-636 files, the WDE discovered 37 students with an Emotional Disability (ED), Other Health Impairment (HL), or a Learning Disability (LD) who did not receive CS, PS, or SW during FFY 2010 *and* were suspended for three or more days during FFY 2009<sup>3</sup>. Even more concerning, the WDE found that 33 of these 37 students failed to achieved a score of 'Proficient' or better on any subsection of the 2011 PAWS (reading, writing, mathematics). The WDE hypothesized that some of these 33 students—21 of whom were still enrolled at the end of the FFY 2010 school

---

<sup>3</sup> At the time of the data review in November 2011, FFY 2009 results were the most recent available to the WDE. The WDE chose to look more closely at students in these three disability categories because they comprised the majority of students with disabilities receiving suspensions that year.

year—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.

## **B. Methodology**

### **1. File Review**

Using the 21 students described above as a 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, eighteen students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Seven student files were removed from the sample by the monitoring team leader before being reviewed in order to ensure timely completion of the file review.
- Four students had moved or transferred out of district.
- Three students’ files contained no information to suggest that they were currently in need of social, emotional, or behavioral services.
- Three students were receiving social, emotional, and/or behavioral services that appeared to be appropriate (some including CS, PS, SW) according to their current IEPs.
- One student graduated in the spring of 2011.

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

- In 1 of the 3 files, the IEP teams had not conducted a Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA), despite members’ documented behavior concerns [34 C.F.R. §§300.304(b)(3), 300.304(c)(4 & 6)].
- 1 of the 3 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)].
- 1 of the 3 files 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)].
- 2 of the 3 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)].
- According to progress reporting information in the files, 1 of the 3 students was not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. The student’s IEP team had not addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- For 1 of the 3 students, there was evidence that some IEP team members’ concerns—including those of parents—had not been adequately addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].
- 1 of these 3 students had grades of ‘D’ or ‘F’ in at least one core academic course; response from the IEP team was unclear [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1 – 2), 300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)].
- 1 of the 3 students’ records reflected a poor attendance history; response from the IEP team was unclear in this student’s case [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)].
- 2 of the 3 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 three specific students and their potential need for social, emotional, and/or behavioral services. Through the interview process, two additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For one student, those interviewed were able to provide evidence that the IEP team had reconvened to address students' behavioral needs and that consent had been obtained for additional assessment.
- One student's behavior had improved during the 2011 – 2012 school year, and district staff members provided compelling evidence to demonstrate that social, emotional, and behavioral services were no longer necessary for him/her.

These reductions left one student remaining in the subsample. The following comments are among those made by district staff, which lend further support for a finding in this area:

#### **Student One**

- The student reportedly has a history of multiple tardies and poor attendance. The student's failure to attend school regularly has negatively impacted his/her grades.
- The student has received multiple detentions due to these tardies.
- Regarding attendance concerns, staff reported the team had not discussed the potential need for a behavior intervention plan, annual IEP goal, or other means of addressing the attendance issues.

### **C. Finding**

The WDE finds CCSD #1 systemically compliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to FAPE – 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 individual student discussed under section B2 above, Campbell #1 must take action on behalf of this student. The student's WISER ID number is listed on the cover letter of this report, and the district must take action to correct the specific areas of concern listed. The WDE requires that the district reconvene the student's IEP team within 45 business days of the date of this report. The IEP team 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 the student's IEP team has already met since the WDE's visit and addressed this student's potential need for social, emotional, and/or behavioral supports and services to address his/her poor attendance, please notify the Department as soon as possible. In any case, within the timeframe noted above, the WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the student's IEP.

### **Area 3: Least Restrictive Environment**

#### **A. Data**

In reviewing the district's most recent WDE-427 data, the Department noted that Campbell #1's environment/placement data were slightly below those of the state as a whole. For example, the percentage of students placed in a Regular Education (RE) environment in CCSD #1 was 61.37% compared to the overall state rate of 62.27%. Under the Resource Room (RR) code,

Campbell #1 reported 30.1% of students with disabilities in this setting during FFY 2010: the comparable state rate was approximately 27%. Finally, the district's percentage of students placed in Separate Classroom (SC) environments was 7.8%, which was slightly higher than the state's SC rate of 7.6% during the same time period.

Within particular disability categories, discrepancies between the district's placement rates and those of the state overall became more pronounced. Specifically, the Department noted that Campbell #1's placement data for students eligible under the Other Health Impairment (HL), Learning Disability (LD), or Emotional Disability (ED) criteria and placed in the Resource Room (RR) environment were higher than those of the state as a whole. Campbell #1 reported 39% of students eligible under the Other Health Impairment (HL) criteria as placed in the Resource Room setting, which was higher than the state rate of 35%. Students identified under the Learning Disability (LD) criteria were placed in the resource room setting 50% of the time, compared to the state rate of 39%. Students identified under the Emotional Disability criteria were placed in the resource room 30% of the time, compared to the state rate of 26%. Additionally, the WDE noted that the district's rates of Separate Classroom placements for students eligible in the HL and LD categories exceeded comparable state rates<sup>4</sup>.

Prompted by these data, the WDE hypothesized that there are some Campbell #1 students with disabilities placed in Resource Room or Separate Classroom settings who could be successfully educated in less restrictive environments with the provision of supplementary aids and services.

## **B. Methodology**

### **1. File Review**

In preparation for the visit, the WDE created a purposeful sample of 38 students, all of whom were reportedly eligible under the Emotional Disability (ED), Other Health Impairment (HL), and Learning Disability (LD) criteria. In addition, all of the students in the sample were served in Resource Room or Separate Classroom settings at the middle school or high school grade levels, and all scored 'Proficient' or 'Advanced' on at least one PAWS subtest in 2011.

Once on-site in Gillette, the WDE reviewed these 38 students' special education files in order to find out more about the IEP teams' rationale for each student's removal from the general education environment. Through the file review process, 23 students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Nineteen student files were removed from the sample by the monitoring team leader before being reviewed in order to ensure timely completion of the file review.
- One student's IEP contained an appropriate justification for his/her removal from general education settings.
- One student had moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student had been placed in a less restrictive environment.
- One student had dropped out of school.

---

<sup>4</sup> Campbell #1 reported 7% of students eligible under the Other Health Impairment (HL) criteria as placed in the SC environment, which was higher than the state rate of 6%. Students eligible under the LD criteria were placed in the SC setting 4% of the time, compared to the state rate of 2%. Students found eligible under the ED criteria were placed in the SC environment 13% compared to the state rate of 13%.

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

- 15 of 15 files contained an inadequate or unclear rationale for the student's removal from the regular education environment [34 C.F.R. §§300.114(a)(2), 300.116, 300.320(a)(5)].
- 14 of the 15 files contained no evidence that the IEP teams had considered a less restrictive environment for the students in question [34 C.F.R. §§300.114(a)(2), 300.115, 300.116(b – e)].
- For 5 of the 15 students, challenging behavior appeared to have been a factor in the placement decision. Of these five student files, only two contained a functional behavior assessment (FBA) [34 C.F.R. §300.304(b – c), 300.114(a)(2), 300.115(b)(2), 300.116(b – e)].
- 1 of 15 files indicated that the students' communication difficulties were a factor in the placement decision. [34 C.F.R. §§300.114(a)(2), 300.115(b)(2), 300.116(b – e)].
- According to progress reporting information in the files, 6 of the 15 students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. The file contained no record of the IEP team addressing the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].

## 2. 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 fifteen students. Through the interview process, ten additional files were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- For six students, Campbell #1 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 two students, district staff provided documentation to show that these students would be placed in a less restrictive environment in January 2012.
- One student was recently moved to a less restrictive setting and was shown to be making adequate progress in each of his/her goal areas. However, this student's IEP had not been amended to reflect his/her new environment.
- For one student, district personnel provided compelling evidence that the student's behaviors have improved and the number of disciplinary incidents has decreased since the student had been placed in a more restrictive environment.

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

- When staff was asked about a student's ability to function in the general education environment with supplementary aids and services, a staff member commented, "[He/She] came too late for us to do that."
- After stating that a student's reading ability was a barrier to participation in a general education math, a staff member noted that the student could function successfully in general education math if certain supports were in place to assist with his/her reading difficulties.

- Regarding one student, staff commented that the barriers to participation in general education are difficulty with written language and organization. These staff members explained that inclusion in general education English would depend on MAP scores.
- In discussing a particular student, a staff member identified specific supplementary aids and services that would likely allow the student to spend more time in classes with his/her nondisabled peers. These supports were not listed in IEP.
- When asked about a student's ability to function in the general education classroom, a staff member commented, "[He/She] works well with a para. If [his/her] skills were supported, [he/she] could work there."
- When asked about a student's participation in the regular education classes, a staff member commented that, "It is a time issue: [he/she] gets so far behind and can't read." The staff member could not describe the supplementary aids and services that had been considered or provided to assist the student with his/her reading difficulties or to compensate for the student's need for extended time to complete tasks in the regular education classroom.

### **C. Finding**

The WDE finds that special education services in CCSD #1 are not always provided in accordance with the LRE requirements established in 34 C.F.R. §§300.114 – 300.116. 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 4: Evaluation Procedures**

### **A. Data**

In reviewing the district's most recent WDE-427 data, the Department noted that Campbell #1 appeared to have a comparatively high percentage of students identified under the Other Health Impairment (HL) eligibility criteria (19.5% compared to the state rate of 15.0%). In addition, the WDE noted that the district's percentage of students with Emotional Disabilities (ED) was below the state's comparable percentage (3.5% in Campbell #1; 6.4% statewide). The WDE hypothesized that some Campbell #1 students who are eligible under the HL criteria might have been identified inappropriately or could be eligible for special education under other criteria.

### **B. Methodology**

#### **1. File Review**

In preparation for the visit, the WDE created a purposeful sample of eleven students, all of whom were 1) eligible under the Other Health Impairment criteria, 2) suspended for three or more days in FFY 2010 and/or 2011, and 3) scored below 'Proficient' on PAWS or didn't participate in the assessment in 2011. Additionally, none of these eleven students were receiving Counseling (CS) Psychological Services (PS) or Social Work (SW) related services.

Once on-site in Gillette, the WDE reviewed these students' special education files in order to find out more about the evaluation procedures followed and eligibility determinations made in each case. Through the file review process, ten students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Four student files were removed from the sample by the monitoring team leader before being reviewed in order to ensure timely completion of the file review.
- Three students' files contained evaluation records that appeared comprehensive, and each student clearly met the Other Health Impairment eligibility criteria.
- Two students had moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student graduated in the spring of 2011.

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

- The file contained an initial evaluation that did not address all areas of suspected disability [34 C.F.R. §300.304(c)(4)].
- The file contained evidence that in evaluating the student, a variety of assessment tools and strategies were not included as a component of the evaluation [34 C.F.R. §300.305(b)(1)].

## **2. 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 student was removed from the sample when district staff members were able to provide compelling evidence to demonstrate how the team had probed all evaluation questions and why the team did not suspect a possible Emotional Disability.

## **C. Finding**

The WDE finds CCSD #1 systemically compliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to Evaluation Procedures 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).

## **Area 5: 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 school<sup>5</sup> during FFY 2010. The WDE decided to explore the provision of FAPE to students in these categories during each of the 2011 – 2012 on-site CIFM visits.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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').

## B. Methodology

### 1. File Review

In planning the visit, the WDE crafted a purposeful sample comprised of all students in Campbell #1 who have a reported disability code of BI, MU, VI or HI and who were not already included in the sample for Area 2 above. After arriving in Gillette, the WDE monitoring team reviewed these fifty students' special education files as the first step in the team's exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, thirty students were removed from the sample:

- Eighteen students' IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit, and each one was making adequate/expected progress.
- Eight student files were removed from the sample by the monitoring team leader before being reviewed in order to ensure timely completion of the file review.
- Two students were removed when the WDE found that the students' disability categories had been reported inaccurately. Both were reported under the Hearing Impairment (HI) category but should have been reported as Other Health Impairment (HL).
- One student had recently moved or transferred out of the district.
- One student was removed from the sample when it became clear that the student may no longer meet the eligibility criteria for a student with a Hearing Impairment.

This reduction left twenty students remaining in the sample. These remaining files exhibited the following violations of federal special education regulations, prompting the WDE to further examine these students' situations:

- 3 of the 20 files included evidence that the student's evaluation was not conducted in a comprehensive manner so that all relevant educational needs could be identified [34 C.F.R. §300.304(b – c)].
- 1 of the 20 files did not have documentation to support the team's determination that additional assessments were unnecessary at the time of the most recent reevaluation [34 C.F.R. §300.305(c – d)].
- 5 of the 20 files contained a current IEP that did not incorporate all of the student needs identified through the team's evaluation reports [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1), 300.324(a)(1 – 2)].
- 5 of the 20 files 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)].
- 8 of the 20 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)].
- 4 of the 20 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)].
- For 3 of the 20 students who use amplification to compensate for a hearing impairment, neither had documentation in the IEP that the aids are checked regularly to ensure proper functioning [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)]
- 8 of the 20 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, 7 of the 20 students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. None of these seven students' IEP teams had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the programs [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].

- 5 of the 20 students 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)].
- For 1 of the 20 students, there was evidence that some IEP team members' concerns—including those of parents—had not been adequately addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.322(a)].
- 6 of these 20 students (all six of whom were enrolled in secondary grades) had grades of 'D' or 'F' in at least one core academic course<sup>6</sup>; response from the IEP team was unclear in each case [34 C.F.R. §§300.320(a)(1 – 2), 300.324(b)(1)(ii)(A)].
- 1 of the 20 students' records reflected a poor attendance history; response from the IEP team was unclear [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)].
- 5 of the 20 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 district special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these twenty students. Through the interview process, seventeen of these students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding five students who appeared to be making inadequate progress, district personnel were able to provide details demonstrating that each of the students were now making sufficient progress and receiving educational benefit.
- Regarding three students whose IEPs did not contain documentation that hearing aids are checked daily, staff provided documentation of daily hearing aid checks.
- Three students were removed from the sample after multiple unsuccessful attempts by WDE staff to contact service providers for phone interviews.
- For two students who appeared to have unmet educational needs, those interviewed were able to provide compelling evidence that the students' needs were in fact being adequately addresses through special education, related services and supplementary aids and services.
- For one student whose file did not contain an audiogram, staff provided an audiogram that was completed as part of the student's last reevaluation.
- For one student whose IEP did not appear to provide necessary services, those interviewed were able to provide documentation that the team had discontinued Adaptive Physical Education (APE) and Physical Therapy (PT) services under a physician's orders due to the student's recent surgery.
- For one student who appeared to no longer demonstrate the need for specialized instruction, the team was able to provide data that the team had discussed a 504 plan but ultimately determined that the student continued to need specially designed instruction.
- For one student whose IEP appeared to have unmet educational needs, those interviewed were able to produce a new IEP that addresses the student's identified academic and social needs adequately.

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

---

<sup>6</sup> One of these six students had documentation showing that his/her curricula had been modified.

### **Student One**

- District staff members stated that this student has identified needs in the area of reading but does not receive services in this area.
- District personnel reported that the student has an identified need in the area of spelling and there are no specific interventions, services or supports to address this need.
- It was unclear from the file and from interviews with district personnel how the student's specific skill deficits are being addressed through an annual goal focused on work completion and general services such as "study skills."

### **Student Two**

- District staff members confirmed that poor attendance impedes the student's learning.
- A district staff member stated that the student is not making adequate progress in the staff member's class and that the IEP team had not reconvened to address the lack of progress. However, those interviewed recognized the need to reconvene and "discuss options to assist this student."
- District personnel reported that the student is failing classes and demonstrated regression on a particular district reading assessment. One staff member suggested that the IEP team reconvene and consider providing counseling services.

### **Student Three**

- Regarding the student's lack of progress on a behavior/self-advocacy goal, a district staff member stated that the student "needs a plan to improve behavior...the team should reconvene."
- Given the student's need for organizational skills and supports, a staff member noted that the student would "benefit from work on organizational skills." The student had no annual goal or services in place to address this area of need.
- The WDE learned from staff that behavior goals, services and supports have not been adjusted based on the results of a behavior assessment completed during the student's most recent reevaluation.

### **C. Finding**

Typically, the WDE requires systemic correction and implementation of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in any instance in which compliance concerns are validated for three or more students. In this case, however, the WDE is asking that the district correct only the student-specific noncompliance, due to the fact that exactly three students remained in the finding out of a comparably large original sample.

The WDE finds CCSD #1 systemically compliant in this area, but on behalf of the three individual students discussed under section B2 above, Campbell #1 must take specific action to remedy the noted areas of concern. The students' WISER ID numbers are listed on the cover letter of this report. The WDE requires that the district reconvene the students' IEP teams within 45 business days of the date of this report. The 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 the students' IEP teams have already met since the WDE's visit and addressed the specific concerns noted above, please notify the Department as soon as possible. In any case, within the specified timeframe, the WDE must be informed in writing of any resulting changes made to the students' IEPs.



## **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 Campbell #1. The Department mailed a hard copy of the survey and a cover letter to each parent of a student currently receiving special education services in the district. Parents had the option of completing the survey on paper or completing it online. The WDE mailed a total of 1,231 surveys, and 195 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (15.84%). In Appendix A of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

**Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring  
Parent Survey for:  
Campbell County School District #1**

**Total Respondents: 195**

**Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 1,231**

**Returned due to invalid address: 20**

**Response Rate: 15.84%**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
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.	6%	7%	10%	26%	52%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	4%	2%	4%	27%	64%
3. My child's school addresses my child's educational needs.	5%	5%	5%	26%	59%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	5%	5%	10%	27%	54%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after school.	7%	4%	17%	31%	41%

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>	<b>Yes</b> 16%	<b>No</b> 66%	<b>Don't Know</b> 19%
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>	<b>Yes</b> 30%	<b>No</b> 62%	<b>Don't Know</b> 8%
8. Are there any additional supports, services or equipment that would enable your child to spend more time in the regular classroom? 8a. If yes, please describe. <i>See following page for parent comments</i>	<b>Yes</b> 9%	<b>No</b> 68%	<b>Don't Know</b> 23%
9. Did your child's school conduct testing in every area in which he/she might have needs that could be addressed through Special Education services? 9a. If no, which areas were not included in the testing? <i>See following page for parent comments</i>	<b>Yes</b> 83%	<b>No</b> 3%	<b>Don't Know</b> 14%

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. My child's school provides me with information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	8%	11%	21%	31%	29%
11. My child's teachers are available to speak with me.	4%	3%	8%	28%	57%
12. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	6%	5%	7%	29%	53%
13. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	5%	4%	12%	28%	51%
14. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	8%	9%	19%	23%	40%

15. 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**  
**Campbell County School District #1**

**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?**

- More communication with the parents informing us what was worked on at school and what we can do at home to continue her learning
- Meadowlark is an amazing school! Everyone involved in my son's IEP is top notch!
- They have only one person that has only been working with my son since 2010 and she is wonderful:
  
- Meet goals in IEP
- I feel they have and are doing a great job.
- is doing well in school thanks to the support that we have received since birth. I'm not sure what else we could do.
- Hire a math teacher that likes children and has a clue on how to teach them. Lessons not individualized to appropriate level and little to no hands on.
- I'm leaning more towards his lack of applying himself. He also refuse help from any para's in the classroom. I don't know how to motivate him in education.
- Yes they need to set individual need plans and teachers need to communicate.
- there great
- I would like more interaction between myself and the special ed teacher to see if we could not do more at home.
- I think they need a little more time during the week if they need help w/language or anything else. More days if possible.
- Reading 20 minutes before each class. This is time he can be learning from teachers. We have our child read a lot at home so he does like to read, and reads very well. But 20 minutes is time lost for children development in classroom. The parents should have the children reading at home to keep them up on reading academics
- The school is doing great in improving his progress.
- Thinking about college yet- can't get diploma???
- Keep him in his regular classroom more so he doesn't miss stuff - assignments, extracurricular activities
- More one on one
- My child "stutters" I wish they would spend more time on that.
- 's sibling is in the same classroom, which causes problems. In addition constant changes are difficult
- Isn't this really always yes? I think the school tries very hard and does a great job. Especially        !!
- Offer a reading program after school, not just before school.
- Take more time for one on one time when child needs it.
- We haven't met yet, since the beginning of the school year. We didn't really discuss anything I just signed the paper and we were supposed to meet later on. I guess I need to speak up and remind them.
- More one on one qualified supervisory help to get schoolwork accomplished. Teachers are always saying they don't have time to spend with one kid when they have a room full!
- Start by getting a SpED teacher that has a clue about SpED
- The SpED teacher lacks knowledge and understanding w/ dealing w/ a SpED student. Test results should be done - for SpED rm only
- A dedicated aide, focus on individual advancement.
- Better communication with teachers and myself. I don't understand if my child is in advanced math, he would have a D+ and yet no one tells me what the process is to get him unstuck. This happened a year ago at another school as well in Campbell Cty before we moved.

- More positive feedback, less negative
- LISTEN
- I'm a little indifferent. I love the help we have been given and don't wish to complain @ all. However, sometimes I wish he could have a little more guidance @ school with every day routine things. He gets kind of stressed and doesn't really have that one safe "go to" person @ this school. But I need to figure that out. It's not all on them. They are great.
- Read skills and comprehension and confidence are low
- Working more 1 on 1 with his speech. Less IPAD non talking time
- Specify homework
- Looking into other disabilities he may have.
- Book club

**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 (x 40)
- Sage Valley dropped the ball ( ) and my son has given up.
- I think is doing great.
- She is very shy socially, I'm not sure what can be done for that.
- Not for the area that he is needing to focus on.
- Yes I do. My daughter would do well with regular counseling sessions based just around her trouble with school.
- No. Not really
- I'm not sure
- Yes, but not from a guidance counselor - too negative!
- N/A
- It might be helpful for both the general ed students and my child to interact more - ie: taking him to practice introducing himself to other students.
- At this time, those services are not needed.
- In evaluation now for autism
- Yes (X 7)
- Because they don't need it.
- No, because they don't need it.
- No, he does very well with these.
- Maybe
- Adjusting well to new school
- In Twin, had as a constant for 3 yr that he was able to talk to & work troubles in school out. He doesn't have that now and has more anger build-up. I don't know there is a solution to that but it was so helpful that long term relationship.
- He receives them at Yes House so they are not needed at school.
- He is very social, do not believe they are needed.
- No, we think our child is fine in these areas.
- My son has been pushed through the system. Teachers don't have time or don't even show up for IEP meetings. But then later after it's too late like to complain about why he is doing poorly.
- No, she is great in this area.
- YES! Been asking since last year for this
- Yes!!! Been asking - school is not offering enough support.
- on some of his life skills
- I'm concerned about advancing him to the next grade. If he's able to or not.
- Child is perfectly normal 7 years old.
- Social
- It has been that he did receive help in the past in these areas. It helped but I think it would cause him more stress @ this point.
- No, he is doing good!
- none

- No, the plan that is in place is just right for him
- Possibly
- He is very involved in sports @ his school

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

- Yes. I love the programs he is in.
- My son just keeps getting pushed on instead of working with him and he should have been held back.
- Yes. He values his time with very much.
- Yes, he gets the one-on-one help he needs at this time.
- Yes - speech counselor
- Social skills - 60 mins a month
- Yes (X 21)
- could use more
- Yes he is becoming more social and assertive
- Yes, thank you.
- Yes I do the school takes good care of my kids
- Yes, again the parents need to take a role in helping the child progress and start the progress of life out of school + what to learn outside of school. Example: keeping track of checkbook, bills, interest rates.
- Yes. He has a behavior plan and his counseling is as needed. He has not needed either for several years but are kept in place as a safety net.
- NA
- Yes, the staff are excellent with our son
- Doesn't receive
- I think so
- Could use more social services
- No. could use more education on how to display emotions.
- They work on social situations and appropriate way to behave.
- Yes, the amount/type varies for all ages which is very nice.
- ?
- Yes. The services provided are adequate but my child requires support that goes beyond what can be given at school.
- Very appropriate. Study skills - class time for him is great.
- In some but not all
- I'm not sure as I don't know there they are. An IEP meeting a couple times a year or some type of "check targets" meeting would be helpful
- No.
- Great amount of help
- Sometimes
- Yes, they are doing a good job.
- Yes. The school is doing all they can and more to help.
- They are helping more than what I expected them to.
- Speech has not improved and in some cases regressing
- I do
- I believe Paintbrush Elementary is doing a well job working with my child's needs/education.
- In the IEP

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

**8a. If yes, please describe.**

- After school programs
- Possibly an e-reader of some type that can help him figure out the words when he is trying to read.
- One on one tutoring with a real math teacher.
- He is in a regular classroom/with no special services and scheduled to graduate in May.

- After school programs
- Books on tape
- There should be adaptive swings on the playground
- Ball seating
- I think they should provide any equipment that helps with them sitting still. Sock buddies, weighted vests or types of chairs that could help.
- Homework - I don't know what's going in 7th grade!
- More computer time
- We are hoping next semester for inclusion
- Yes. An aide designated to her alone.
- He spends most of his time within regular classroom. He only leaves for his speech lesson.
- Have programs that are more personal to each child (not general)
- Have a website they can access from home, library, etc.
- She just started so I don't expect to anything for a little while. I will have to take the survey again once she has been in the program a while.
- An aide would benefit my child and was discussed in our last IEP meeting.
- Properly educated teacher's aids! Teacher's aides are not educated to provide appropriate supervisory help.
- A child/student in need of more support but the school is not willing to put more support in place.
- ED program or a para that is highly trained or trained w/ an understanding for SpED would be a start.
- So we are having him see a counselor for additional support.
- He is too far behind for his class level. He is in fourth and at a kindergarten level.
- He spends all his time in the classroom and has places where he is "stuck" for most of the year when extra help in the special ed room having it explained over and over may help. Also this would help the anxiety issues while getting un-stuck.
- More reading

**9. Did your child's school conduct testing in every area in which he/she might have needs that could be addressed through Special Education services?**

**9a. If no, which areas were not included in the testing?**

- Our school has not had a school psych for the past 2 years.
- Believe did
- Probably wasn't time. Again, pushed through!
- Psych evals not done.
- OT, for starting - only test was speech
- I would like to have him further tested or have up-dated screenings of some sort. Just because he grows in one area, he may still lack in others.
- Bipolar
- I took her in for a private hearing screening performed by an audiologist - it didn't work out for her to have it done at BOCES.
- does not want to read!

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

- is my husband not my child. My son is on IEP for speech.
- I just want to thank everyone involved in these schools and districts. Such amazing people doing everything in their power to help my son succeed.
- My son is just a number to this school district. He is not an athlete, so it really doesn't mean anything here. We tried to get help, but the junior high schools aren't equipped for this either. This has been an ongoing struggle for my son the last four years. He is frustrated with the system as much as I am.
- #11: I met w/all of his teachers, but one left me sitting there 2 nights in a row for over 30 minutes each. I finally just left.
- None at this time.
- Great work Sage Valley Jr. High, CCSD Gillette
- They (the teachers) have a TON of paperwork to fill out!

- Wagonwheel is such a good school. I'm very pleased with all the teachers.
- My child's grade have improved this year, since this program thank you!!
- None
- None
- My daughter had the best teachers available since she began school. They have helped her more than my husband and I ever could have. We feel blessed and grateful to live in such a wonderful school district.
- I teach at the same school my daughter attends - this makes it easier for me to talk to her teachers but if I was a reg. parent it would be much more difficult - most teachers are either late or gone coaching.
- Rawhide's speech program has helped my child so much!
- No
- I feel the teachers need to communicate to the skills teacher in areas of struggle in those subjects. Please call us for our concerns.
- All my daughter's service providers are outstanding!
- Meadowlark is a great school
- The IEP meetings are very helpful in addressing praises, concerns, and goals. They have definitely helped a lot.
- I would like him to receive more help Books on Tape - Phonics
- I very much appreciate the help that cc school has provided us.
- It has been a very positive experience for my son.
- Have not yet had a meeting this school year
- There is a lack of honesty and communication between the school and parents.
- Me and my wife are very happy with IEP program
- My child's case manager in his school is wonderful and always available to offer help. Her name is . She needs a raise. :-)
- Yes, our child receives good education. :-)
- Roget has made my children show great success in elementary and go above and beyond as a school.
- I really don't like how they change their aides that are working with them and I feel parents should have some say on who is chosen to be their aide!
- I believe the parents need to take more of a role in their children educations, behavior. I think send work sheets home for parents to go over with child to get them more involved. Make parents sign off that child has read and did homework. Make the parents more responsible + not use the school as a babysitter for their children.
- The team at Paintbrush is awesome!
- My son is a senior this year. He receives very minimal services. Most services are in place as a safety net in case he starts slipping.
- Our school is really great with helping our children to learn to their fullest ability.
- I think they're doing a good job at Wagonwheel, having had other children with speech problems. I think there may be an over emphasis on speech. I think it's more of a time thing than a learned accomplishment. We'd prefer most of special time be spent on 3R's.
- My son only receives speech services.
- Pronghorn elementary is the first school my child has been in that I feel-honestly wants to see him succeed in life in and out of school.
- The IEP team has been awesome to work with. Can't wait to see what the rest of the year brings.
- RE Q1: It was unclear if she would be going to summer school. This was addressed to the parents of (father + son same name) BUT only goes to CSD#1 and is in IEP. Son is 3 and in preschool and is not special needs. This was answered as to .
- I do not feel like I have been informed this year how he is doing with his IEP. Last year when I was concerned he needed more testing the teachers at his other school told me to wait until this year to do testing.
- The school does well, a little additional help with speech therapy would be nice. Thx!!
- Twin has been a positive experience for and I've felt helped with my child's needs in his education.
- has been blessed with a good IEP - Staff is in support and she was never written off as a bad child. Thanks
- No, doing well
- I went to school in CCSD. It seems like the level of help for students has went down, while the expectations are higher!
- Please give and her staff some type of award or special recognition. :-)
- VERY happy with services given
- No
- This program is excellent
- The staff at Pronghorn Elementary are very supportive, and caring.

- Campbell County High School is not an advocate for my son's education. Your funds are being misappropriated! A waste of resources! # 11: My son's caseworker is to be calling me with a weekly update which she never does. Usually does not return my phone calls. My son was in school for over 2 weeks without textbooks before teachers noticed! (When school started the new year 2011/12)
- Schools have no clue on 504 and SpED laws. They are not meeting the needs of the students and you really should pull the SpED resource logs and the IEPs - the logs will not meet what the IEP states.
- I know that SpED students are not being pulled for the amount of time that the IEP states the students need to be in SpED resources.
- Wright Junior/Senior High has been great for . Some great teachers.
- Very little communication since last IEP meeting. I usually e-mail for info and progress. She is very good w/ communication.
- Better communication through the school year! Social skills camp is amazing!! That is about the most informative for me and most growth for my child every year I see! Leaps and bounds after he's not "stuck" on things anymore.
- School dist has come a long way from the way they use to conduct and treat parents and students.
- CCSD is an excellent school district they are very helpful. They have really gone out of their way to help.
- I really think the school made a big difference in my child's learning. The teachers devoted their time and effort for my child to understand the things she's learning. Thank you.
- This is his 1st year @ Sage Valley - so we are still adjusting.
- My child is now a straight A student, what more could a parent want?
- My son has met his goals, but asks to still be in speech because he enjoyed it so much.
- I am impressed with my child's school he is attending this year. 2011-12!
- Campbell County SD has done an awesome job taking care of my child's needs!
- Very pleased with the assistance my son received. Much better than anything we have gotten in .
- Thank you for helping us.
- I feel my child's needs have been met, his teachers and case worker go above and beyond for him.
- I am very happy with staff that works with my son. I wish general ed teachers in Junior and high school were too.
- They have done a great job.



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

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Female	47	30%
Male	108	70%

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
African American	3	2%
Hispanic	4	3%
Mixed Race	1	1%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	1%
White	145	94%

<b>Primary Disability Code</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Autism	16	10%
Traumatic Brain Injury	2	1%
Cognitive Disability	4	3%
Emotional Disability	7	5%
Hearing Impairment	7	5%
Other Health Impairment	26	17%
Learning Disability	39	25%
Multiple Disabilities	2	1%
Orthopedic Impairment	3	2%
Speech/Language Impairment	49	32%

<b>Grade Distribution</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Grades 6-8	36	23%
Grades 9-12	26	17%
Grades K-5	93	60%

<b>Environment Code</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Regular Environment	86	55%
Resource Room	49	32%
Separate Classroom	18	12%
Separate School	2	1%