



**Continuous Improvement
Focused Monitoring Report
for**

NIOBRARA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #1

January 24 – January 27, 2012

**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

Niobrara County School District #1

School Year: 2011 – 2012

Date of On-Site Review: January 24 – January 27, 2012

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 influences the 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. 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), plus one randomly selected district, were most likely to be selected for on-site CIFM visits. Niobrara County School District #1 was the randomly selected district for 2011 – 2012.

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

Niobrara County School District #1 is considered a small school district and reported a special education population of 803 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	Niobrara 1	State (minus Niobrara 1)
<i>Number students on July 2011 427 File</i>	127	15,339
A. Math proficiency rates for special education students in spring 2011	56.00%	47.67%
B. Reading proficiency rates for special education students in spring 2011	44.90%	38.71%
C. Sum of A. and B.	100.90%	86.38%
D. Math proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2008	54.35%	41.62%
E. Reading proficiency rates for grade 7 and 8 special education students in spring 2008	28.00%	29.49%
F. Sum of D. and E.	82.35%	71.11%
G. Difference Score: C minus F	0.1855	0.1527

As mentioned above, Niobrara #1 was selected for an onsite monitoring visit at random. However, the data in this chart are interesting to consider. Although the formula results did not trigger the WDE’s selection of Niobrara #1 as a focused district, the WDE

reviewed the formula results after the district's random selection. In terms of the statewide proficiency rate variables that are included in the selection formula, Niobrara #1's data compare favorably to the state overall. In total, the district's regular statewide assessment proficiency rates for students with disabilities in reading and math increased by 18.55% from the 2008 administration to the 2011 administration. The increase is most notable in the area of reading, in which 44.90% of the district's 7th and 8th graders scored 'Proficient' or 'Advanced' on the regular 2011 PAWS reading test. In contrast, 28% of the students with disabilities in Niobrara #1's 7th and 8th grade classes demonstrated proficiency in this content area during the 2008 PAWS administration.

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 Niobrara County School District #1

In preparation for the on-site monitoring visit, WDE reviewed Niobrara County School District #1 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 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 at secondary grades.
2. **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.
3. **FAPE – Assistive Technology** This hypothesis was developed due to the district's low rate of students receiving Assistive Technology devices and/or services when compared to the state rate.
4. **FAPE – Extended School Year** This hypothesis was formulated in response to district data showing a comparatively low rate of students receiving Extended School Year services.
5. **Evaluation Procedures** This hypothesis was prompted by data showing a comparatively high identification rate of students with Specific Learning Disabilities within the district's population of students with disabilities.

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. Within each of the samples described in this report, the WDE focused exclusively on students with disabilities who were physically located in Niobrara #1 schools. The Department is conducting a set of focused monitoring activities for students with disabilities served in the district's virtual education program, and those results will be issued under separate cover.

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 Niobrara 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

In FFY 2009, 2010, and 2011, Niobrara #1's statewide assessment proficiency rates for students with disabilities were largely comparable to or better than the state's overall rates. However, the WDE identified 22 currently enrolled students who scored below 'Proficient' on one or more PAWS subtests during their most recent assessment. The WDE also noted that over half of these 22 students are placed in a Resource Room (RR) setting. 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 22 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, five students were removed from the sample when the WDE determined that their IEPs appeared to be reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit and each was making adequate/expected progress.

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

- 11 of the 17 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)].

- 9 of the 17 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)]
- 5 of the 17 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 17 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)].
- 3 of the 17 students' current IEP is unspecific about the provision of supplementary aids and services [34 C.F.R. §300.320(a)(4)].
- 4 of the 17 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, 9 of the 17 students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. Only 2 of these 9 students' IEP teams had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- 4 of 17 files contained annual goals which had not changed meaningfully from year to year [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)]
- 4 of 17 showed evidence that some IEP team member's educational concerns had not been addressed [34 C.F.R. §300.320-321]
- 2 of 17 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)]
- 2 of the 17 student's records showed three or more behavior incidents 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 seventeen specific students. Through the interview process, four additional students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Regarding three 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, those interviewed were able to provide compelling evidence that this student's needs in the area of behavior were in fact being adequately addressed through special education and related services.

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

- When asked about a particular student's educational skill deficits, staff very capably described them, but had not incorporated this information into the goals because they found it difficult to measure. The data regarding these skill deficits was not summarized in the PLAAFP or included in the goals.
- For two students who were receiving OT and/or PT services, staff members confirmed that the services were not tied to any specific annual goals in the students' IEPs.

- Although general and special education personnel reportedly speak with each other on a daily basis, staff reported that the IEP team had not reconvened or amended a particular student's program to address his/her regression in the area of reading.
- WDE interview teams confirmed that progress reports were not always issued by related service providers—even though the related services were tied directly to specific annual goals in the IEP.
- When multiple district staff members were asked about certain students' progress in annual goal areas, the WDE also confirmed that several missing progress reports for special education services had not been issued.
- When asked about the adequacy of one student's current social-emotional services, district staff members confirmed that the student needs more counseling services. The IEP team reportedly increased the frequency of the counseling service and decided to provide them through the summer. These changes were not documented in the IEP.
- Regarding one student's annual goals (which did not seem to address his/her unique educational needs), staff reported that the student's goals are not related to specific needs but are tied to graduation requirements.
- For one student, certain special education and related services were dropped without explanation. Those interviewed could not explain the change in services either.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that special education services in Niobrara #1 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 – 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 school² 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.

² 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 Niobrara #1 who have a reported disability code of BI or MU (the district reported no HI or VI students); the sample totaled just one student. After arriving in Lusk, the WDE monitoring team reviewed his/her special education file as the first step in the team's exploration of this hypothesis. Through the file review process, the team discovered that this student was also included in the WDE's sample for Area 1 (FAPE – Educational Benefit). As such, the student was removed from the sample for Area 2 to avoid duplication of effort.

C. Finding

The district will not be required to address this area through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Any FAPE concerns that the WDE had about the student in this sample are addressed through Area 1.

Area 3: FAPE – Assistive Technology

A. Data

According to the 2010 WDE-427 report submitted by the district, only 3.1% of students with disabilities in Niobrara #1 received Assistive Technology (AT) over the course of the 2010 – 2011 school year. This number is notable when compared to the overall percentage of students receiving AT in the state as a whole, which stood at approximately 14.2% during the same period.

WDE staff created a purposeful sample of students more likely than others to need Assistive Technology in order to receive FAPE. This sample was composed of three students who were not receiving Assistive Technology according to the most recent WDE-427 data. All of these students were reportedly eligible for special education under one of the following criteria: Traumatic Brain Injury (BI), Hearing Impairment (HI), Multiple Disabilities (MU), or Visual Impairment (VI). The WDE hypothesized that some of these students might be in need of Assistive Technology devices or services in order to receive FAPE.

B. Methodology

1. File Review

Once on-site in Lusk, the WDE reviewed these three students' special education files. Through the file review process, one file was removed from the sample when it became clear that the student did not demonstrate a need for Assistive Technology. This reduction left two students remaining in the sample. Both 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:

- 1 of the 2 files included an evaluation report describing student needs that could be potentially addressed through the provision of Assistive Technology devices and/or services [34 C.F.R. §§300.301(c)(2)(ii), 300.304(b)(1)(ii), 300.304(c)(6), 300.305(a – d)].

- 1 of the 2 files contained a current IEP describing needs that could be addressed through the provision of Assistive Technology, yet no AT services or devices were designated in the student's program [34 C.F.R. §§300.324(a)(iv)].

2. Interviews

At the conclusion of the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed Niobrara #1 special education staff, general education staff, and related service providers regarding these two students' educational needs and their possible use of Assistive Technology. Through the interview process, both students were removed from the subsample when the WDE found that the two students were in fact receiving Assistive Technology services and/or using AT devices. In both cases, district staff demonstrated that the type and amount of AT being delivered was appropriate given the students' needs.

C. Finding

The WDE finds that Assistive Technology devices and/or services in Niobrara #1 are provided in accordance with the FAPE requirements established in 34 C.F.R. §§300.101 and 300.105. The district will not be required to address this area in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

Area 4: FAPE – Extended School Year

A. Data

During the data review meeting for Niobrara #1, WDE monitoring team members noted that the district's percentage of students receiving Extended School Year (ESY) services was below that of the state as a whole. Specifically, the district was providing ESY to approximately 9.4% of its students with disabilities; the comparable state rate was 17.3%.

Although ESY services may be provided to any student with a disability who needs them, students who are eligible in particular disability categories are more likely to receive ESY³. Within the top categories of students who are often provided with ESY, Niobrara #1 had thirteen students who were not receiving ESY according to the district's 2011 WDE-427 results. The WDE hypothesized that some of these thirteen students may be in need of ESY services in order to receive FAPE.

B. Methodology

1. File Review

The WDE monitoring team selected the thirteen students mentioned above as its purposeful sample for Area 4. The WDE's first step in exploring this hypothesis was a focused review of these students' special education files. Through the file review process, eight students were removed from the sample for the following reasons:

- Three students were in fact being provided with ESY services.

³ For 2009 – 2010, Wyoming's statewide data showed that students who are eligible in the following disability categories are most likely to receive ESY services: Multiple Disabilities (56%), Cognitive Disability (48%), Autism (33%), Traumatic Brain Injury (30%), Orthopedic Impairment (24%), and Visual Impairment (19%).

- Three students' files contained evidence that ESY was offered by the school but parents declined the services.
- Two of the students' files did not contain any evidence to suggest they were in need of ESY services.

This reduction left five 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:

- 5 of 5 files included evaluation reports describing student needs that could be potentially addressed through the provision of Extended School Year [34 C.F.R. §§300.301(c)(2)(ii), 300.304(b)(1)(ii), 300.304(c)(6), 300.305(a – d)].
- All 5 files contained a current IEP describing needs that could be addressed through the provision of ESY, yet no ESY services were designated in the students' programs [34 C.F.R. §§300.324(a)(iv)].
- 2 of the 5 files contained a current IEP that did not contain annual goals addressing each 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 5 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 5 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)].
- 2 of the 5 students' progress reporting information for each goal 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 5 students were not making adequate or expected progress in one or more goal areas. None of these 3 students' IEP teams had addressed the lack of progress by reconvening or amending the program [34 C.F.R. §300.324(b)(1)(ii)].
- 3 of the 5 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 2 of the 5 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)].

2. Interviews

Following the file review, WDE monitoring team members interviewed special education staff, general education teachers and related service providers regarding these five specific students and their potential need for Extended School Year services. Through the interview process, three additional students were removed from the sample when district staff members were able to provide compelling evidence to demonstrate that these students were not in need of ESY services.

These reductions left two 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:

Student #1

- The student demonstrates short-term memory deficits and doesn't remember facts from one week to the next.

- Student had shown regression in the area of reading from first quarter to second quarter.
- When asked about the student's possible need for ESY, staff reported that after-school Extended School Year services for reading were offered, but the student does not attend due to other obligations.
- The IEP team has not reconvened or amended the program to identify an alternative ESY schedule that will meet the student's need for reading services outside of the regular school day and/or calendar.

Student #2

- The student demonstrates serious regression in reading after the summer break and struggles with facts.
- The student's current IEP states that he/she would benefit from increased instruction throughout the year. The school has offered ESY, but the student did not attend.
- The IEP team has not reconvened or amended the student's program to arrange an alternative ESY schedule that will meet the student's need for services outside of the regular school day and/or calendar.

C. Finding

The WDE finds NCSD #1 systemically compliant in this area. The State's compliance hypothesis related to Extended School Year 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, Niobrara #1 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 5: Evaluation Procedures

A. Data

In reviewing the district's most recent WDE-427 data, the Department noted that Niobrara #1 appeared to have a comparatively high percentage of students identified under the Specific Learning Disability (SLD) eligibility criteria (47.2% compared to the state rate of 35.3%). In addition, the WDE noted that three of the district's students with Specific Learning Disabilities receive counseling as a related service. The WDE hypothesized that one or more of these three Niobrara #1 students who are eligible under the SLD criteria might have been identified inappropriately or could be eligible for special education under other criteria.

B. Methodology

1. File Review

Using the three students described above as its purposeful sample for this hypothesis, 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, two students were removed from the sample when the WDE discovered that they should not have been reported as eligible under the SLD category. One of the students' eligibility was under the Cognitive Disability (CD) criteria, and the other was eligible under the Hearing Impairment (HI) criteria.

This reduction left one student remaining in the sample. Although this student's eligibility under the SLD criteria was well established in the file, he/she was also reportedly eligible under the State's Speech Language Impairment (SL) criteria. However, the student's file did not contain evidence that a variety of assessment tools and strategies were included as a component of the evaluation that resulted in his/her SL eligibility [*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. The following comments are among those made by district staff which lend further support for a finding in this area:

Student #1

- In the student's IEP from the 2010 – 2011 school year, Language services were changed from a related service to a special education service when the student was reportedly found eligible under the SL criteria.
- The student's special education file contained no documentation regarding the rationale for the change (evaluation reports, Prior Written Notice forms, etc.).
- The student continues to receive Speech Language services despite the fact that the evaluation team does not appear to have probed the student's needs in this area through a comprehensive evaluation.

C. Finding

The WDE finds NCSD #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).

However, for the individual student discussed under section B2 above, Niobrara #1 must take action on behalf of this student. His/her 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 letter. The team must consider the listed areas of concern in order to ensure that the student's evaluation has sufficiently set forth his/her educational needs and possible eligibility under the state's Speech Language Impairment criteria. If the IEP team has already met and addressed these evaluation concerns, 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 eligibility or his/her 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 Niobrara. 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 63 surveys, and 18 parents returned completed surveys to the WDE (31.03%). In Appendix A of this report, the complete survey results are included for the district's review.

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

Total Respondents: 18

Total Parents who were mailed a survey: 63

Returned due to invalid address: 5

Response Rate: 31.03%

	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.	0%	18%	18%	35%	29%
2. My child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	0%	0%	0%	39%	61%
3. My child's school addresses my child's educational needs.	0%	11%	0%	50%	39%
4. My child has made adequate progress over the course of the past year.	0%	0%	18%	47%	35%
5. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after school.	0%	6%	33%	39%	22%

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	No	Don't Know
	35%	53%	12%
7. Does your child use assistive technology (AT) devices at school? NOTE: Assistive technology devices are items/equipment used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. 7a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these devices at school? 7b. If yes, are the amount/type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child? <i>See following page for parent comments</i>	Yes	No	Don't Know
	28%	44%	28%
8. Does your child receive Extended School Year (ESY) services? 8a. If no, do you think your child would make more progress if he/she received these services? 8b. If yes, do you think the amount/type of these services is appropriate for your child? <i>See following page for parent comments</i>	Yes	No	Don't Know
	35%	53%	12%
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>	Yes	No	Don't Know
	89%	0%	11%

	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.	11%	33%	33%	17%	6%
11. My child's teachers are available to speak with me.	0%	0%	6%	28%	67%
12. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%
13. My child's school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	6%	6%	28%	17%	44%
14. My child's school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	11%	28%	22%	17%	22%

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
[REDACTED] 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?

- Not waiting 8 WEEKS to be tested
- There is always room for improvement
- They do a lot!!
- Follow the child's IEP more. If they leave the room to take a test then that is what needs done.
- Upgrade expectations
- One on one instruction
- The special education department needs to be more forceful to some of the general educators to realize students IEP needs and to fulfill those needs

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

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

- No (x4)
- I don't think so.
- ?

7b. If yes, are the amount/type of assistive technology devices available at school adequate for your child?

- Yes (x3)
- Computer
- Yes. Most definitely

8. Does your child receive Extended School Year (ESY) services?

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

- No (x6)
- No, does better resting in between
- Not sure - probably

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

- No
- Absolutely
- somewhat
- Yes. I think its long enough
- At times, needs more services

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?

[no answers given]

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

- Somewhat dissatisfied with the amount of time it took to get my child tested. 8 weeks seems ridiculous when there are only 200 kids in the school. At the meeting that finally came, no paperwork was ready. The printer wasn't printing. Just seemed to not be a priority to be prepared for our meeting or to even get the meeting set up. FYI - that is in Lusk. NOTE on Q12: Answer is for TEACHERS only: Thank you for your attention and for your quality assurance efforts.
- LEMS doing a much better job with my kids' IEP than [REDACTED] Elementary
- [REDACTED] is making more progress at LEMS due to more focused and individualized attention.
- For 14 we use Uplift
- Use Uplift
- I am not really sure how to answer as we have only had one IEP meeting and that was last year.
- I do think that since January the school has made more efforts to help/follow my child's needs

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

Gender	N	%
Female	8	57%
Male	6	43%

Ethnicity	N	%
Hispanic	4	29%
White	10	71%

Primary Disability Code	N	%
Cognitive Disability	1	7%
Hearing Impairment	5	36%
Learning Disability	4	29%
Speech/Language Impairment	4	29%

Grade Distribution	N	%
Grades 6-8	5	36%
Grades 9-12	4	29%
Grades K-5	5	36%