



Suffield Public Schools

Special Education Review

October, 2011

Respectfully submitted by:

Margaret MacDonald, Ph.D.

Lucy Krause

Anthony Malavenda

Deborah Richards

CREC Special Education Program Review Team

***"In order to transform schools successfully,
educators need to navigate the difficult space
between letting go of old patterns and grabbing
on to new ones" Deal 1990***

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	
Introduction	
Methodology and Data Gathered	1
Key Findings	
Educational Benefit.....	3
Processes	10
Resources	15
Communication/Collaboration.....	17
Commendations	20
Recommendation	22
Appendix.....	26 (A-I)

Suffield Executive Summary
Special Education Review
10/31/11

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The findings on Suffield's special education processes, educational benefit, resource utilization, and communication and collaboration were determined by collecting and analyzing data from:

- 1) State and local documents
- 2) 33 IEP reviews
- 3) 11 In-depth student reviews
- 4) 32 Classroom observations
- 5) 171 Parent surveys
- 6) Focus group interviews with 132 parents (45) and staff (87).

Educational Benefit

Data indicate that overall, students with disabilities are receiving educational benefit from the programs and services provided by Suffield. The extent of the benefit varies depending upon the severity of the disability and the school and program the student attends. There was evidence of specialized instruction, options for support within the general education classroom, alignment of IEP goals with curriculum standards, and collaboration among special education, general education teachers, and parents. IEPs and student files were complete and well organized, students received a high level of service and specialized programs, and students with disabilities were well accepted by peers and staff. The district employs outside consultants to assist in the special education programs and services at all levels. Parent survey results indicate that 80% of the responses from elementary and middle school parents on statements related to satisfaction with their child's program, their child's participation in the school community, and their child's skills were in the agreement category. The preschool and high school parents indicate a mid-70% range agreement in the same three categories. The statements, *The IEP meets my child's needs* and *My child is accepted in the school community* had highest agreement and *Data is used to inform instruction and shared with the parent* had the highest disagreement. CMT test scores for students with disabilities show growth in math, reading and writing, although reading has not met the state target. CAPT scores in all areas have not made state target, however the "achieving proficient" percent continues to increase each year in all four areas. Students with more significant disabilities are typically placed in out-of-district placements and so it was difficult to measure the educational benefit that could be provided by Suffield were they to stay in district. Over half of the parents of preschool and high school children with autism indicated on the survey that they were not satisfied with the skills that their child was learning. Areas for improvement of educational benefit include: 1) data collection and analysis that monitors student progress and informs instruction and communication and collaboration with parents on collection and analysis of student data 2) staff supervision and instructional leadership to guarantee high quality services and fidelity of implementation 3) programs and services for high school students with behavior challenges 4) expansion of secondary transition services 5) emphasis on direct instruction and rigor for high school students with disabilities 6) clarification of the preschool program model 7) evaluation of the effectiveness of the extended school year program 8) co-teaching at Spaulding and Suffield High School 9) reading and writing instruction for students with disabilities across the district 10) district-wide services for students with significant disabilities.

Processes

The Scientific Research Based Intervention (SRBI) process in the elementary and middle schools serves as a resource for students who are struggling prior to referral to special education. Student records are well organized and thorough and are in compliance with IDEA procedural requirements. The frequent turnover of central office administrators, the lack of strategic plans (district, school and special education), unclear and ineffective delineation of administrators' roles and responsibilities, inconsistent services and processes from school to school,

inadequate hiring and supervisory practices, and insufficient focus on teaching and learning create challenges for the district in providing educational benefit and in communicating effectively with parents. The district utilizes two separate organizational structures, special and general education when students would be better served by combining them into a unified structure to meet the needs of all students.

Resources

Overall, the district is providing the resources necessary to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Suffield students with mild disabilities tend to have more services, delivered more frequently than one would see in other districts, while students with significant disabilities appear to be placed out-of-district. The number of students placed into out-of-district schools by the district has doubled in the past two years and an increase in the number of students placed out-of-district will probably continue unless the district proactively develops quality programs for students with more significant disabilities (autism, behavior, multiply handicapped). Use of outside agencies for transition and vocational assessment services also impacts the special education budget. The lack of a high school department chair for special education, and a preschool coordinator causes challenges in process and communication. The district provides a variety of professional development opportunities to staff and instructional materials and other resources for students with disabilities.

Communication and Collaboration

Both communication and collaboration between parents and staff and staff-to-staff was analyzed with data from in-depth student reviews, classroom observations, parent surveys and focus interviews. All schools participate in a variety of methods (email, notes, phone conversations, team meetings, PPTs, etc.) to communicate within the school and to communicate with parents. Overall, elementary and middle school staff are working well together and communicating. Lack of a special education department chair and planning time for co-teachers at the high school has resulted in less effective communication. Frequent changes in central office leadership and inconsistent application of processes across the district create uncertainty among both staff and parents regarding the district's philosophy and direction for students with disabilities. Communication with special education staff and central office should be more frequent and focus on teaching and learning and consistency of special education processes.

Parent survey data indicate that the majority of the parents (89% and 87%) in elementary and middle school responded in agreement to questions related to satisfactory communication with staff, while 76% of preschool and high school parents were in agreement with these statements. Parent survey data indicate that the parents of children with autism are generally not as satisfied with the programs, communication and transitions. A common theme in parent focus group interviews was the importance of keeping "on top of" the schools, to ensure their child received a proper program. Some parents indicate that they have lost trust that the district will provide what is on the IEP, that they will hire qualified staff, and monitor programs for fidelity of implementation. The purpose of SPEDPAC is not clear. Parents and staff agree that the communication when students transition to a new school needs improvement. Inconsistent information is sometimes provided depending upon which administrator a person speaks to. Comments on the survey and in focus interviews indicate a complex picture of communication with parents in the district. While most building staff indicate that they did a good job in communicating with parents and the majority of parents indicated the same, there were some parents who experienced significant problems with the communication they received from the district. It is not atypical for parents to have inconsistency of experiences; however in Suffield this is more pronounced.

COMMENDATIONS

The CREC evaluation team appreciates the assistance provided by the offices of the superintendent and pupil services in conducting this review. Staff members in the buildings were very helpful in providing both time and information. Parents of students with disabilities in Suffield contributed enormously to this report through their completion of surveys and interviews with team members.

The Superintendent and the district leadership team have identified core approaches of SRBI, and differentiated instruction, along with strategies and structures that will support the work that is required to enhance educational benefit for students with disabilities. Included in these strategies and structures are school improvement plans and a district improvement plan that will increase consistency of practice across the district.

The district's records are well organized, paper work is complete and timelines appear to be met. A secretary in each school is assigned these duties and this is an apparent priority for the district. The majority of the IEPs reviewed are well written and aligned with curriculum standards, the goals and objectives meet identified needs, and the assessments are appropriate. The district is in its third year of using IEPPLUS, an electronic database system for IEPs promoting easier access to student information.

Classroom observations and in-depth reviews revealed that IEPs are implemented appropriately and students receive the services listed on the IEP. Students with disabilities are accepted in the general education classroom by their peers as evidenced by natural friendships, conversations and inclusion in activities. General and special education staff demonstrates their willingness to problem-solve and share resources and expertise. The district provides a high level of intensive services to students with disabilities that are well documented on the IEPs and delivered, as evidenced by staff and student schedules and observation. The district met state target for percent of students identified with disabilities and time with nondisabled peers and has made notable on the CMT math scores for students with disabilities. Gains in proficiency are noted in CMT and CAPT scores in all areas.

The preschool program is committed to an integrated preschool setting with a 50-50 ratio of students with disabilities and students without disabilities. At Spaulding the students are making good progress on meeting the goals and objectives identified in their IEPs, the school and classrooms have a positive culture and climate and students are highly engaged. General education teachers are comfortable with the inclusion of special education teachers and related service staff in their classroom. The school has a strong Scientific Research Based Intervention system with resources to support it.

At McAlister the early intervention process is a collaboration of all staff, but is clearly a general education initiative that utilizes special education staff in a support role rather than a primary role. The general and special education teachers work collaboratively in delivering services to special education students in a classroom setting. Special education students are well integrated into the school and included in general education classes. The transition process for students grade to grade at McAlister School is effective for special education students because staff collaborate to ensure the success of students. The care and concern that administration and staff demonstrate for all students is obvious as one observes classes and travels around the building.

The middle school has a strong positive energy throughout the building, and the mission statement "Our Learning Community Values Respect and Responsibility for All" is practiced. Special education teacher caseloads are manageable. There is a strong communication system among staff/parents about students. Programs and services for special education students operate the first day of school and plan time for co-teachers is provided. Staff are aware of student needs/strengths as stated in their IEP's. Online resources for instruction and management are provided to staff.

Special education teachers at the high school attend professional development activities to enhance their resource and intervention classes. Paraprofessionals are placed according to their strengths. General education classrooms are highly visual and display student work. General education teachers are comfortable with the inclusion of special education students in their courses. One resource room has an informative display about IEP's. CMT and CAPT scores overall have shown improvement in the last two years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Develop and implement a 3 year special education action plan that incorporates recommendations from this report. The plan should be used to inform school improvement plans and determine staff goals, supervision and monitoring activities. Special education programs and services are reliant on the practices that are used in the district for all students. Therefore, the special education plan should be supported by and part of the district and school improvement plans. We were very pleased to see the district's emphasis on a theory of action that includes: 1) Standards and Essential understandings for student learning for all 2) Data as the vehicle for examining progress and 3) Collaboration – as an environment to focus on learning, District practices in all these areas will benefit all students, including students with disabilities.

The superintendent will work with stakeholders to develop, monitor and communicate the plan to parents, Board of Education and staff. As the plan is implemented, the superintendent and district leadership team will use the data to continuously monitor progress and make changes in the plan as needed. It is expected that the plan will be a living document and as data dictate, changes in the plan's activities should occur.

Embedded in the 3 year strategic plan should be a **100 day plan** that addresses the high priority activities that will have the greatest impact. The CREC report provides recommendations that include activities needed to meet goals, and suggested timeframes for implementation of the activities.

Three Year Goals:

- 1) Increase the focus on teaching and learning, high quality services, and fidelity of implementation for students with disabilities.
- 2) Meet state target for all areas on CMT and CAPT for students with disabilities.
- 3) Increase opportunities within the district for students with significant disabilities to be served.
- 4) Implement and monitor consistent standards across the district for parent communication, service hours, and development of service delivery model, data collection, and analysis and sharing.
- 5) Improve transitions at all levels.
- 6) Improve communication and collaboration with parents.

Recommended Activities for 100 Day Plan (high priority and greatest impact)

Data to Inform Instruction

Data collection and analysis should be in the 100 day plan due to the impact on CMT/CAPT scores, high quality services and fidelity of implementation, improvement of collaboration and communication with parents, and consistent standards across the district. We are pleased that data as the vehicle for examining progress has been identified by the district leadership team as an important district-wide initiative. The leadership team can assess data as a “problem of practice,” and conduct structured rounds to get more information on how the district is using data to inform the instruction of students with disabilities. After implementation of the recommendation, frequent monitoring of the process will ensure fidelity of implementation. Parent and staff information sharing will be an important component of the process. A district committee representing all grade levels should regularly review CMT/CAPT scores and curriculum based assessments of students with disabilities to determine whether teaching across the district is comprehensive and aligned with student needs.

Instructional Leadership

All of the goals we identified for the special education plan relate directly to the importance of instructional leadership and so we recommend that the district review job responsibilities of administrators and realign responsibilities to provide increased time to support teaching and learning, high quality services, consistent processes, and fidelity of implementation. Increased collaboration between general education and special education with a focus on teaching and learning for all students is recommended.

Background Information

Suffield Board of Education member, Mary Lou Sanborn contacted CREC in April, 2011, to request a comprehensive review of special education services in Suffield Public Schools. In a letter sent to the Board of Education on March 15, 2011, 20 parents requested that a special education task force be formed by the Board to address the following areas of concern: communication and collaboration, programs, transition, data, and bullying. As a result, the Board of Education requested a comprehensive special education study to look at all areas of the special education program and to further explore the following four parental concerns: lack of data to make informed decisions, communication and collaboration, special education programs, and transitions. A program review is a broad investigation that considers a variety of data sources. Its purpose is to provide feedback that can be used to direct program change, validate program progress, or, as in many cases, both. This review was conducted by four Capitol region Education Council (CREC) consultants from June to October 2011.

Evaluation Questions

The Suffield Board of Education posed the following four questions for this review:

1. To what extent are special education students receiving educational benefit from the programs and services provided by the Suffield Public Schools?
2. Are the processes used by special education and related services effective and efficient?
3. Are resources utilized effectively and efficiently to meet the needs of the special education population?
4. To what extent is the communication with stakeholders effective in meeting special education student needs?

Methodology

A variety of data were collected and analyzed in order to answer the evaluation questions. Please see Table 1 Matrix.

Documents and Reports

- Aggregate and disaggregate trend data at the state, DRG, and local level regarding special education
- District budget, staffing, in-district and out-of-district placement information
- Reports from the district and state on state indicators from the State Performance Plan (SPP)
- Student achievement data
- Staff caseloads and staff and student schedules
- Individual Education Plans (IEPs)

Student IEP Review

A representative sample of 33 special education student IEPs was selected and reviewed utilizing established protocol designed to assess educational benefit. See appendix for description of sample and protocol.

In-depth Student Review

Eleven special education students representing various disability categories and ages were randomly selected for in-depth reviews. See appendix for description of sample and protocol. These students were observed in classrooms, their confidential file was reviewed, and parents and staff were interviewed.

Individual and Group Focus Interviews

Input from the following 129 stakeholders was obtained through individual and focus group interviews during September and October, 2011. Focus group participants include:

- Thirty-six parents of students receiving special education or 504 services

- Nine parents of students selected for in-depth interviews
- Eighty-four building and central office staff, including paraprofessionals, administrators, outside consultants, special education and general education teachers, and related services staff.

For additional information see appendix.

Observation of Classrooms

Thirty-two classroom observations were conducted in the district to assess the learning environment for inclusion and instructional practices, school/classroom climate, and implementation of the IEP. Five classes were observed at Spaulding (including preschool); seven were observed at McAlister, eight at the middle school and twelve at the high school.

Parent survey

A survey (see appendix) was sent via mail on June 10, 2011, to 403 Suffield parents of students receiving special education (295) or 504 (108) services who attend in-district or out-of-district schools. 171 (42%) of the surveys were returned by June 27, 2011, to CREC in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that we provided. For demographics, survey and cover letter, see appendix.

Table 1: Matrix of key questions with a cross-walk of data sources

	IEP/ In-depth Student Review	Classroom Observations	District and State Data	Focus Interviews	Parent Survey
1. To what extent are special education students receiving educational benefit from the programs and services provided by the SPS?	X	X	X	X	X
2. Are the processes used for special education effective and efficient?	X	X	X	X	X
3. Are resources utilized effectively and efficiently to meet the needs of the special education population?	X	X	X	X	X
4. To what extent is the communication with stakeholders effective in meeting special education student needs?	X		X	X	X
	33 IEPs reviewed for educational benefit in-depth review conducted on 11 students	32 classrooms were observed in the district's 4 schools	SDE statistics: special education prevalence, out-of-district placements, CMT/CAPT	84 staff, 3 consultants, and 45 parents were interviewed=132	171 surveys (41%) were returned and analyzed

KEY FINDINGS

Each question is addressed with a summary of the key findings. For additional data, please see the appendix.

Question 1 Educational Benefit	IEP And In-depth Student Review	Classroom Observations	District and State Data	Focus Interviews	Parent Survey
To what extent are special education students receiving educational benefit from the programs and services provided by the Suffield Public Schools?	X	X	X	X	X

Findings:

Summary: Data indicate that overall, students with disabilities are receiving educational benefit from the programs and services provided by Suffield. The extent of the benefit varies depending upon the severity of the disability and the school and program the student attends. There was evidence of specialized instruction, options for support within the general education classroom, alignment of IEP goals with curriculum standards, and collaboration among special education, general education teachers, and parents. IEPs and student files were complete and well organized, students received a high level of service and specialized programs, and students with disabilities were well accepted by peers and staff. The district employs outside consultants to assist in the special education programs and services at all levels. Parent survey results indicate that 80% of the responses from elementary and middle school parents on statements related to satisfaction with their child's program, their child's participation in the school community, and their child's skills were in the agreement category. The preschool and high school parents indicate a mid-70% range agreement in the same three categories. The statements, *The IEP meets my child's needs* and *My child is accepted in the school community* had highest agreement and *Data is used to inform instruction and shared with the parent* had the highest disagreement. CMT test scores for students with disabilities show growth in math, reading and writing, although reading has not met the state target. CAPT scores in all areas have not made state target, however the "achieving proficient" percent continues to increase each year in all four areas. Students with more significant disabilities are typically placed in out-of-district placements and so it was difficult to measure the educational benefit that could be provided by Suffield, were they to stay in district. Over half of the parents of preschool and high school children with autism indicated on the survey that they were not satisfied with the skills that their child was learning. Areas for improvement of educational benefit include: 1) data collection and analysis that monitors student progress and informs instruction and communication and collaboration with parents on collection and analysis of student data 2) staff supervision and instructional leadership to guarantee high quality services and fidelity of implementation 3) programs and services for high school students with behavior challenges 4) expansion of secondary transition services 5) emphasis on direct instruction and rigor for high school students with disabilities 6) clarification of the preschool program model 7) evaluation of the effectiveness of the extended school year program 8) co-teaching at Spaulding and Suffield High School 9) reading and writing instruction for students with disabilities across the district 10) district-wide services for students with significant disabilities.

1) State Data Related to Educational Benefit

Data from the Connecticut State Department of Education, Bureau of Pupil Services State Annual Performance Reports (APR), CMT/CAPT reports for 2008 - 2011 were analyzed and the following trends were identified:

- Suffield met state target in 2008 and 2010 for participation rate on the CMT.
- Math: There has been an increase in the CMT math scores of Suffield’s students with disabilities over the past 3 years from 69% in 2008 to 78% (slightly below state target) in 2009. 2011 Suffield Scores exceeded the State scores for both proficient and goal in grades 3, 4, 5 and 7. Grade 6 exceeded the State scores for proficient, but was slightly below state for goal and down versus the 2010 performance Grade 3 scores were up 3.8% at the goal level in comparison to 2010. Cohort comparisons show that Grades 5, 6 and 8 have shown growth at the proficient and goal level over the 4 year period. Grade 4 has shown growth at the goal level over the 2 year period (Appendix I).
- Language Arts: Suffield students with disabilities did not meet state target on the CMT in reading for 2008, 9, and 10. The middle school special education students went from not meeting goal in 2009 to making safe harbor in 2010. For 2011 reading scores in grades 4, 5, 6 and 7 exceeded the state average scores for both proficient and goal. For reading grade 3, Suffield is below the state average in both proficiency and goal scores are down compared with 2010 grade. Suffield exceeded the state average scores for both proficient and goal for writing in grades 4, 5, 6 and 7. Grades 3 and 8 significantly exceeded the state average scores in writing for proficient and were below state for goal. Cohort comparisons show that Grades 6 and 7 have shown growth at the proficient and goal level over the 4 year period in both writing and reading. Grades 4 and 5 have shown growth at the goal level in writing. Grades 4 and 8 have shown growth at the goal level in reading. Grade 5 has shown growth at the proficient level in reading (Appendix I).
- CAPT scores in 2011 for students receiving special education services did not meet state target, but are above the State in all areas at the proficient level and below the State in all areas at the goal level. An analysis of Suffield’s CAPT data for special education over the past two years (2010 - 2011) indicate that Suffield’s students have made gains in the areas of math, reading and writing in proficiency and goal with exception of writing at goal level where there was a 5% drop. The scores in comparison to goal show a drop in terms of CAPT participation (Appendix I).
- Suspension data indicate that Suffield went from not meeting target in suspension and expulsion rates in 2008 to meeting target in subsequent years.
- Suffield has consistently met state target over the three year period 2008-11 in the category of “Time with Nondisabled Peers” (TWNDP).
- According to the State’s Annual Performance Report, the category of Early Childhood Outcomes, Suffield met all but one of the indicators, *Use of Knowledge and Skills*. This area increased from 47.1% in 2008 to 55.6% in 2009, missing target by 3.3%.
- Suffield did not meet target in 2010 for the transition indicator, *Develop Goals and Transition services*.

2) IEP Educational Benefit Review

A representative sample of 33 IEPs was randomly selected for review to determine if they were reasonably calculated to ensure educational benefit. The protocol used to determine educational benefit reviews the alignment of present level of performance, goals and objectives, services, and progress on goals and objectives in addition to compliance requirements such as current and complete IEPs (see Appendix A for protocol). Twenty-eight IEPs out of 33 (85%) met Educational Benefit requirements as described in Appendix A. Three (100%) preschool IEPs met educational benefit as did five (100%) student IEPs in grades 1-3. Seven (100%) at McAlister met educational benefit, and seven of the eight (87%) IEPs reviewed at the middle met educational benefit. Eight out of ten (80%) IEPs reviewed at the

high school met educational benefit. Overall, these scores are high, indicating that the IEPs are well aligned, well designed, and show student progress. Some procedural areas for improvement include indicating student ethnicity and the case manager's name on the IEPs. High numbers of service hours and identification of students who may not meet the criteria for special education was noted. We observed general, rather than specific statements for "adverse effect on educational performance." Building specific information is in appendix.

3) In-depth Student Review

Eleven students representing various disability categories and grade levels were selected randomly for an in-depth review that included IEP review, observations of the student in class, review of student work and schedule, and interview with staff, parents, and student (as appropriate). A protocol was used to determine if the student received educational benefit from their programs (Appendix B). Overall, the in-depth student reviews at Spaulding, McAlister, and the middle school were rated by the reviewer as effective in promoting positive learning outcomes. The educational programs of these students were appropriate and aligned with the IEP (goals and objectives, data collection, and accommodations, and modifications). Students were included and accepted in least restrictive settings and staff was satisfied with student progress. In three cases, parents indicated dissatisfaction with the program and services. Some parents stated that they had to stay involved in their child's special education program to ensure that it was being implemented. It was also noted that there was no autism specific tool used for triennial evaluations in IEPs reviewed. Some students in out-of-district placements could have received their programs within the district in least restrictive environment. One student received itinerant speech and language services who would not have qualified for those services according to Connecticut State Department of Education guidelines.

4) Classroom Observations

Thirty-two observations of general education and special education classrooms were conducted across the district to assess the learning environment for inclusion and instructional practices, school/classroom climate, and implementation of the IEP. Five classes were observed at Spaulding (including preschool); seven were observed at McAlister, eight at the middle school and twelve at the high school. The CREC review team was impressed with the climate and culture of collegiality between staff. Classrooms were well organized and students were respectful of staff and each other. Multiple staff was in each classroom and they all appeared clear on their roles and responsibilities. In the elementary and middle schools, students were highly engaged. At the Middle school the co-teaching model is implemented effectively for all classes observed and general education classes are proportionally balanced with special education and general education students. Paraprofessionals in adult-assist classes (paraprofessional support in general education class) support teachers and all students. High School special education teachers are beginning to develop a structured course "Targeted Instruction."

There is variation in what is taught and how it is taught from one school to the next. For example, at Spaulding academics appear to be the responsibility of the special education teacher and at the High School it appears to be the responsibility of the general education teacher. Spaulding does not participate in co-teaching, while the other schools do participate. At the middle school and high schools there were an excessive number of adult-assist classes and ratio of adults to students was more than needed. At the high school, emphasis appears to be on assisting students with homework, rather than teaching strategies for independence and mastering core content. At the high school the co-teaching model could be more effective, and the ratio of special education students to general education students in some co-taught classes is too high. Some high school classes did not have a high level of student engagement.

6) Parent Survey

Survey responses to three survey categories (15 questions) were grouped by 1) Agree (strongly, moderately and slightly) and 2) Disagree (strongly, moderately and slightly). As described in Table 2, 84% to 93% of the responses from the parents of elementary students indicate that they were in agreement with positive statements about their child’s program, child’s participation, and child’s skills. Similarly, parents of middle school students indicated agreement in 84% to 87% of their responses. Parents of preschool students agreed 86% of the time that their child was getting the skills they needed, while the other areas showed 76% and 79% agreement on satisfaction with child’s program and child’s participation, respectively. The high school parents agreed 82% and 87% for child’s participation and child’s skills and 75% for satisfaction with child’s program.

Table 2: Parent Survey Results to three categories of questions about educational benefit

School	Satisfaction with Child’s Program	Child Participation	Child’s Skills
Preschool	76% agree 24% disagree	79% agree 21% disagree	86% agree 14% disagree
Elementary	86% agree 14% disagree	93% agree 7% disagree	84% agree 16% disagree
Middle School	87% agree 13% disagree	89% agree 11% disagree	84% agree 16% disagree
High School	75% agree 25% disagree	87% agree 13% disagree	82% agree 18% disagree

Further analysis of the 15 survey questions in the three categories representing educational benefit revealed similar responses to three questions. The parents of preschool and high school children both had the highest satisfaction with the statement *My child is accepted within the school community*. Elementary and middle school parents groups both had the highest satisfaction with the statement *My child’s IEP is meeting his or her educational needs*. One parent stated on the survey, “We are especially impressed that our son is being taught coping skills to deal with situations that extend beyond the classroom doors”. The parents of preschool, middle school and high school all indicated the highest rate of dissatisfaction with the statement *Data on my child’s progress is used to inform instruction and that data is shared with me*. This statement was the second to highest for dissatisfaction from the parents of elementary students. One parent stated in the survey, “I don’t always trust the data on which goals and recommendations are built- the data can be easily skewed by my child’s anxiety or attitude during the evaluation” Further survey information is provided in Appendix C).

The statements in the satisfaction with program category that received the highest percent agreement (85%) from preschool parents are *My child is accepted within the school community* and *Special education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated in my child’s IEP*. One parent stated on the survey, “We have been extremely happy with the school, they are always prompt and really nurture you through the process that can be worrisome or stressful at times. We are grateful for the services we have received”. The statement that received the highest percent (29%) disagreement was *Data on my child’s progress is used to inform instruction and that data is shared with me*.

Parents of elementary age children rate the highest percent agreement (89%) in the satisfaction with program category to each of the following statements *Special education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated in my child’s IEP*, *I have the opportunity to talk to my child’s teachers on a regular basis*, and *My child’s IEP is meeting his or her educational needs*. The highest percent disagreement (19%) was to the statement *General education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated in my child’s IEP*. This was also mentioned as a problem for students who had 504 plans as one parent stated, “The information in the 504 plan does not appear to be looked at (by the teachers) until a few weeks into the year”. Another parent stated, “I’ve wondered if the classroom teachers have read my child’s IEP and how to approach him and accommodate for him. I have wondered about the same thing with the administration.”

Parents of middle school age children indicated the highest percent agreement (90%) to each of the following statements *My child's IEP is meeting his or her educational needs, Staff is appropriately trained and able to provide my child's specific program and services, and General and special education teachers work together to assure that my child's IEP is being implemented.* The highest percent disagreement (17%) was to the statement *Data on my child's progress is used to inform instruction and that data is shared with me.*

Parents of high school age children responded the highest percent agreement (81%) to the following statement *My child is accepted in the school community.* The highest percent disagreement (37%) was to the statement *Data on my child's progress is used to inform instruction and that data is shared with me.*

A review of the 33 surveys completed by parents of children with autism revealed much less agreement in the three categories, with the exception of parents of elementary students who indicate a higher rate of agreement. Of particular note is the large percent of preschool and high school parents that are dissatisfied with the skills their child is learning (Table 3). The statement *My child is learning skills that will enable him/her to be as independent as possible* had only a 50% agreement with parents of high school students and a 33% agreement with preschool parents.

Table 3 Comparison of survey results parents of children with autism

School	Satisfaction with Child's Program		Child Participation		Child's Skills	
	All parents	Parents of children with autism	All parents	Parents of children with autism	All parents	Parents of children with autism
Pre K	76% agree 24% disagree	63% agree 37% disagree	79% agree 21% disagree	73% agree 27% disagree	86% agree 14% disagree	40% agree 60% disagree
Elemen.	86% agree 14% disagree	100% agree 0% disagree	93% agree 7% disagree	100% agree 0% disagree	84% agree 16% disagree	70% agree 30% disagree
Middle School	87% agree 13% disagree	83% agree 17% disagree	89% agree 11% disagree	71% agree 29% disagree	84% agree 16% disagree	75% agree 25% disagree
High School	75% agree 25% disagree	28% agree 72% disagree	87% agree 13% disagree	67% agree 33% disagree	82% agree 18% disagree	20% agree 80% disagree

7) Focus Group Interviews

Eighty-four staff, three consultants, and forty-five parents were interviewed= 132

Parent Focus Groups

Thirty six parents with students in the four schools participated in semi structured focus group interview sessions and 9 parents shared comments over the phone or email. Parents in attendance were encouraged to email to CREC any additional comments that they could not share in the group. Two parents emailed additional comments and two parents called and spoke to CREC team members over the phone. Some parents were very pleased with their child's program, others mildly pleased and others very displeased.

Five themes emerged across the majority of the parents.

- 1) There are some very good staff who work hard
- 2) The quality of the program was largely dependent upon the quality of the teacher and other staff assigned to their child

- 3) Parents had to stay on top of things in the school if they wanted their child to get what he/she needed
- 4) Greater satisfaction with the programs, services, and communication when their child went to McAlister.
- 5) They had to go to great measures to get their child identified and many paid for independent evaluations.

Positive themes included, willingness of staff to accommodate their child, the way the school included their child, the useful assistance they received and satisfaction with the meetings held about their child and the services provided.

Negative themes centered around poor staff quality and staff supervision and evaluation, miscommunication between administrators, lack of clarity regarding the preschool programs and services, instruction was not guided by data, meaningful data was not shared with parents, transition from school to school and secondary transition was not smooth, preschool parent visiting policy, unclear and inconsistent programs and communication, lack of transparency at Spaulding, lack of communication about child's IEP and accommodation plan at the high school, poor progress on IEP goals, administrative decisions that affect their child are not communicated, parents feel that they are not listened to by administration, lack of trust in administrators, and SPEDPAC meetings are not useful.

Staff interviews

Overall, staff from all schools indicated that they believe that the programs and services that they were providing to special education students were satisfactory. Staff at the preschool level indicates a strong commitment to integrated preschool with 50-50 ratio, but this is a challenge for special education teachers to be responsible for the curriculum that meets the needs of both students with and without disabilities. Preschool staff believed that the success of the program is due in part to good use of related services integrated into preschool setting and staff home visits where they provide materials to parents to use in home. Preschool staff indicated a need to define the 5th day better. SCERTS is seen as an umbrella program for teaching social skills. The next step is to embed IEP objectives into centers. This year the outside consultant is working to focus more on specific needs of students with disabilities and how to integrate IEP objectives into the classroom activities.

Spaulding K-2 staff indicates there is no co-teaching occurring, but teachers indicated that they have time to collaborate. The school began SCERTS program two years ago – in kindergarten, expanded to first grade last year and second grade this year. Staff report this has improved their social skills service providing them structure and ways to identify skills and take data. There is a good team approach and this creates similar expectations from grade to grade. The Focus program is in its third year and staff indicated that it has positive structure and allows students to get full experience of morning kindergarten without pulling students for services. It is hard for students to go from this structure to first grade without similar support. General education teachers have some difficulty with special education students who display inappropriate behavior. They have trouble ignoring behavior that would not be tolerated from the rest of class. All staff are trained in responsive classroom. The school has a Crisis Resource Team that is trained in CPI. Kindergarten has the SOAR program which provides a full day program to students who are struggling with literacy skills.

Staff at McAlister is very satisfied with the progress students are making. The addition of the Wilson Reading Program is reported as having a very positive effect on students' reading progress. Data used to document student progress consists of in-class assessments, formal assessments, DRA, DRP, CMT's and running records. Administration stated that teachers meet weekly by grade level to discuss data. A formal data team process is not in place. Students have access to the general education curriculum. General and Special Education staff work well together to ensure that special education students have access to the general education curriculum and that the students receive the necessary services in the

general education setting to ensure student success. Student progress is reported to parents through parent conferences, team meetings with parents, email, report cards, grades posted on-line. Program changes are made based on student data or parental request. Changes are considered at team reviews and in consultation with administration. Changes are made through the PPT process. Staff rated the effectiveness of the services provided to special education students a 3.75 out of 4. Parent satisfaction was rated as a 3.5 out of 4.

There was positive energy in the Middle School and staff are excited about the work they are doing with students. SAM and SRBI teams meet weekly. Communication about students is a high priority for all faculty, as stated in focus interviews. Staff indicated that special education programs were running day one of school year. SLP services started first day of school. General education teachers have IEP pg. 8 and goals/objectives immediately. Staff feels that the special education supervisor is highly visible in building; he attends team meetings and committee meetings. The school psychologist acts as coordinator for services. Teacher's within the building provide PD for each other and they feel this is a good way as no one knows their needs as well as they do.

Staff at the high school indicate concern that there is no program for students with behavior difficulties and that co-teaching is not a shared partnership and there is not sufficient plan time for co-teachers. There was concern expressed about students with executive functioning; these students were uncomfortable going to resource rooms. Note; one resource room is set up as a daily living type room with couches and kitchen facilities. Special education teachers use internet sources; they would like a budget to order more resources for their students. Guidance states they do not have access to IEPPLUS and general education teachers indicate concern that IEP page 8 was two weeks late and they don't have access to the IEP goals and objectives.

8) Secondary Transition Services

The school social worker is key person for transition services and career Work experience (CWE) is offered to (5) senior special education students. The class consists of special education students who require additional instruction in the area of pre-vocational skills and life skills. Three days a week the students are placed at jobsite within the community, one day a week the students work within the school and one day a week is used for instruction. The classroom curriculum is based on the Life Centered Career Education Program from the Council of Exceptional Children and covers three areas: daily living skills, social skills and occupational guidance and preparation. Special education teachers are also responsible for implementing transition services, conducting transition assessments and implementing the transition goals and objectives in the students' individual education plans. There is a transition road map of services to be delivered to students each year. Last November, a CREC consultant presented on indicator 13, transition goals and provided informal transition assessments to the staff. To improve transition services, the community work experience class should include more than only the most severe students. There are many more students who would benefit from the community work experience class. The community work experience class currently services only juniors and seniors; students would benefit from an emphasis on independent living and social skills in their freshman and sophomore year. Students in grade 12+ are out placed into work programs.

Question 2 Processes	Ed Benefit & In-depth Student Review	Classroom Observations	District and State Data	Focus Interviews and Parent Survey
Are the processes used for special education and related services effective and efficient?	X	X	X	X

Findings

Summary: The Scientific Research Based Intervention (SRBI) process in the elementary and the middle schools serves as a resource for students who are struggling prior to referral to special education. The district's student records are well organized and thorough and the district meets the state determined targets with many IDEA procedural requirements. The frequent turnover of central office administrators, the lack of strategic plans (district, school and special education), unclear and ineffective delineation of administrators' roles and responsibilities, inconsistent services and processes from school to school, inadequate hiring and supervisory practices, and insufficient focus on teaching and learning create challenges for the district in providing educational benefit to all students and in communicating effectively with parents. The district utilizes two separate organizational structures, special and general education when students would be better served by combining them into one structure to meet the needs of all students.

1) State Data Related to Process

IDEA Requirements

Annual Performance Reports (APR) which correspond to the State Performance Plan for 2008-2010 indicate that Suffield met state target for three years in the elimination of disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, determination of eligibility in accordance with state established timelines, transition IEPs by age 3, general supervision, and timely and accurate reporting.

Prevalence of Disabilities

The district's identification rate of students with disabilities is lower than the state and DRG average, however the identification of students with learning disability, autism, and intellectual disability rates are higher than the DRG and state averages.

Table 4: Prevalence Percent Comparison

School Year	Suffield	DRG	State
2010-11	9.9	10.5	11.6
2009-10	10.6	10.5	11.6
2008-9	10.4	10.8	11.6
2007-8	10.3	10.7	11.5

Identification rate of students who qualify for 504 is consistent with identification rates in other districts, with the exception of the high school where over half of the district's 504 population is located.

Table 5: 504 students 2011

Grades	Number. of Students
K-2	2
3-5	12
6-8	26
9-12	43
Total	83

2) Eligibility and Identification Process

The district has a variety of activities to identify students with disabilities including community child find and a SRBI process. Suffield conducts community Child Find activities for preschool children on a regular basis. The district is identifying some preschool students for itinerant speech and language services who do not meet the criteria in accordance with State Department of Education guidelines for eligibility. Evaluation of and eligibility for special education under the diagnosis of autism seems to rely heavily on outside evaluators. Preschool students who are identified on the autism spectrum from the Birth to Three System do not always receive a re-evaluation of this diagnosis when they enter preschool or upon their first triennial evaluation. Two students were assessed with the CARS at the preschool level and staff referred to the use of the ABELS, but no evidence of its' use was found in the sample used for the program evaluation.

The SRBI framework in K-8 grades appears to be progressing and providing students with support prior to identification as special education, however the process between schools varies. Implementation of Scientific Research Based Intervention (SRBI) at Spaulding has expanded access to remedial support and resources to teachers who have struggling learners. SRBI processes are clearly defined and have increased the use of data collection. The use of academic benchmarks and universal social skills screening allow students to be identified early and provided support as necessary. The mini grade level teams are well established and appear to function well. The communication sheet includes parents. There are many options for Tier II and III supports including 16 reading tutors. Some staff expressed concern that the process may go on for too long, but students are getting intensive support. Mini teams ask special education teachers or specialists to attend when they get to Tier II or III. The staff want to move to digital format for all SRBI documentation. The principal meets once a week with reading specialist to review Tier III students. The school does conduct social skills screening three times a year for all students as part of universal screen. The school psychologist plays a large role in SRBI, collecting data on behaviors and running social skills groups. The general education teachers in K and grade one each have an academic support person to provide extra 1:1 help. They meet with related services one time a week regarding students in their class. Some parents at Spaulding report that the process to get their child identified can be long and frustrating. One parent stated in the survey, "I am happy with the current services I am receiving. I was however, very unhappy with having to attend 2 evaluations for my son's speech, then expected to attend 2 meetings to sign the paperwork. The process took too long to get him services, despite the fact that the school did everything on time, as required."

The pre-referral/SRBI process at McAlister includes a "SAM" (Student Assistance Meeting) team. The process is driven by general educators. Special education staff members participate, but do not spend an inordinate amount of their time in the SAM process. Interventions occur using the Tier model. Staff expressed that the pre referral process takes too long for some students and that students new to the school, who have had interventions in their prior school often start the process from the beginning. The special education process follows federal and state requirements. Overall, the SRBI/SAM process at McAlister and Middle School is an effective and efficient pre-referral process. General education staff members take the lead in running this process. This process allows special education staff to participate as necessary but to have ample time to provide services to the identified special education students.

We have received mixed communications regarding independent evaluations. The district indicates that they typically approve and pay for independent evaluations at the parent's request. Some parents indicate that the district does not approve independent evaluations and does not inform the parent that if they refuse the request, the district must file for due process. Parents stated that it is a slow and frustrating process to get their child identified and that many times the only way it gets done is if they pay for the outside evaluation.

3) Transitions

All schools have activities in place to ease the transition from year to year across classrooms and schools. Students are afforded opportunities to visit new schools and the staff from the receiving schools attend the annual end of the year PPTs for students. Staff indicates the need for more time to meet with teachers and paraprofessionals in the new settings prior to the new school year to share specifics on successful strategies and supports for students. The transition process of students from grade to grade at McAlister is seen by staff as being very effective. Teachers meet with each other to share information. Receiving teachers may also observe students and attend PPT meetings when appropriate. However, staff and building administration feel that the transition process for students between schools could be improved. Unfortunately, because the special education programs look so different in each school, the transition is still problematic for some students and parents. Staff described problems with some transitions because of lack of consistency from school to school – i.e. SRBI.

Elementary to middle school have numerous transition activities such as:

- Step-up day, where students shadow another student and eat lunch in café.
- Step-up night for parents.
- Grade 6 team goes to McAlister.
- Friday/Saturday structured games to get the feeling of the building.
- In June the Youth Services coordinator has a family barbeque
- The social worker brings special education students to building if needed
- All special education students have a transition PPT and SMS teachers attend.

Middle School to High School activities include:

- Parent orientation night
- HS guidance comes to the building and schedules individual students
- Grade 9 orientation day and Advisory for incoming grade nine students
- Special education teacher representative attends SMS transition PPT's (not always case manager)
- Social worker will bring special cases to SHS on an individual basis
- School orientation day
- Guidance meets at SMS to make course schedule
- Guidance has an evening orientation in Feb. for all parents
- First Friday guidance meets with small group of 9th graders
- SHS guidance and psychologists meet with SMS counterparts at end of school year

Parent survey responses indicate successful transitions from school to school, into preschool and out of high school had 60% to 78% agreement with parents. Parents of children in preschool and high school were most dissatisfied with transitions (Table 6). A common theme in the parent focus groups was the differences between the schools and the need to better prepare students and staff for the changes.

Table 6: Parent Survey Transition

School	Transitions agree	Transitions disagree
Preschool	78%	22%
Elementary	71%	29%
High School	60%	40%

4) Staffing Assignments and Supervision

The Director of Pupil Services evaluates all related services staff and the director and supervisor share the evaluation of paraprofessionals. Responsibility for hiring and evaluating special education teachers lies primarily with the building administrator. Central office special education administrators are involved in the hiring process and when there is an issue with a teacher. They do not attend goal setting meetings or end of year evaluation meetings, unless there is a problem and do not conduct observations in the classroom, as part of the evaluation of teachers. Because of an instance in the past where a special education staff was hired without the necessary credentials, the superintendent has instituted a new hiring process.

At Spaulding, it is unclear how paraprofessional support is assigned, whether by central office or building administrator. Parents indicated concern that paraprofessionals are not assigned at the beginning of year. Time dedicated to supervision and evaluation is limited. Staff and parents felt that at times, poor performers were allowed to stay too long.

At McAlister and the middle school the special education teachers schedule, train and supervise the paraprofessionals. Staff indicate that the general education teachers would benefit from training on how to use paraprofessionals in the classroom when working with students with significant disabilities.

5) Progress Monitoring and Data Collection

Although staff indicate that they collect a variety of data on special education students and our observations confirm this, it is unclear how the data is used to inform instruction for students with disabilities. Some parents indicate in the survey and focus interviews that the data provided to them did not give them with the information needed to understand their child's progress. The process to collect, analyze and use data to inform instruction of students with disabilities appears to be left to the special education teacher and so there were inconsistencies in practice.

Spaulding staff report that they are becoming more consistent with data collection. Each paraprofessional has a folder with the child's objective in a similar format for data collection purposes. Staff brings data, percentages and graphs to team meetings. Staff indicates that the data is shared with parents at conferences. McAlister special education staff gathers and use data similarly to Spaulding. Although staff indicate that the data is shared with parents, two of the three parents interviewed for in-depth review felt that there was not enough useful data shared with them. Grade level teams meet to regularly review and discuss data; however they do not follow a formal data team analysis model.

Suffield Middle School collects student data in a variety of ways: Formal assessments, school benchmarks, CMT's, CFA's, team meetings discussion, and behavior check sheets. Parents also provide data when invited to team meetings. Special education teachers are part of the data teams. They also have a strong SRBI team that collects data and provides services for struggling students.

At the High School student data is collected from report cards, CMT's CAPT scores, quizzes, tests, scored CAPT practices, Portfolios, Triennials, CFA's, PSAT, SAT and point sheets. Special education teachers have CAPT scores for their caseload. They do not attend core subject department data team meetings. There did not appear to be evidence of activities to connect data to analyze IEP goals/objectives progress.

6) PPT Process

The district asks parents, students, and staff to complete a Participant Survey PPT/IEP Meeting Feedback form. The district received 17 responses from students, 242 from parents, 218 from special education

teachers, 211 from administrators, 143 from general education teachers, 319 from related services personnel, and 55 from other. Results from the survey indicate the percent that are in agreement to the following statements:

- 1) There is a strong sense of trust between IEP members: 98%
- 2) This IEP team works together with a shared vision for this student: 99%
- 3) This IEP team is able to develop an appropriate IEP for this child: 96%
- 4) There is an open communication with parents/school staff outside of this PPT process: 98%
- 5) The IEP team members work and share information comfortably together: 98%

The CREC parent survey asked three questions related to the PPT process. Overall, all three questions had a 73% to 91% agreement. Results varied somewhat depending on the school, with elementary and middle school responses higher than preschool and high school (Table 7). One high school parent stated in the survey, “The school arranges PPTs at a time that is only convenient with them”. A preschool parent stated, “I dread going into PPT meetings because my opinion is not valued”.

Table 7: Parent survey questions and the PPT process

Question	Preschool		Elementary		Middle School		High School	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
I understand what is discussed at meeting to develop my child’s IEP	78%	23%	90%	10%	91%	9%	89%	11%
PPT meetings for my child have been scheduled at times and places that met my needs	87%	14%	93%	7%	83%	17%	73%	17%
and I have received a copy of my child’s IEP within 5 school days after the PPT	73%	28%	91%	9%	89%	11%	80%	20%

Parents in focus interviews had mixed feelings about PPTs, with some indicating that they are useful and that they feel they are a member of the team and others indicating that they do not have the appropriate staff at the meeting and the meetings are too short. Staff indicate in interviews that they felt the PPT process was useful and that they were following the IDEA requirements.

7) Leadership Roles and Responsibilities

Numerous changes in Suffield central office leadership has occurred over the past five years. Frequent changes in leadership can cause confusion in communication and processes related to special education and can eventually affect the educational benefit that students receive. Parents and staff alike indicate the changes in philosophy and practices that have occurred because of administrative turnover have caused difficulties.

The division of duties for central office special education administrators is as follows: Supervisor of Special Education is assigned to preschool, Spaulding, McAlister, and the Middle School. The Director is assigned to the high school, out-of-district placements, ELL, 504, Health Services, Bullying, Tutoring, and supervision of all related services staff and some paraprofessionals. In addition, the Director takes the lead in mediations and due process hearings. The supervisor reports to the director and the director reports to the superintendent of schools.

Responsibility for program development, model of service delivery and staff assignments in the schools is primarily that of the building administrator. Responsibility for the preschool program at one time was that of the central office special education administrator, then it was changed to the building principal and now it is unclear who has ultimate responsibility.

Question 3 Resource Utilization	Ed Benefit In-depth Student Review	Classroom Observations	District and State Data	Focus Interviews and Parent Survey
Are resources utilized effectively and efficiently to meet the needs of the special education population?	X	X	X	X

Findings:

Overall, the district is providing the resources necessary to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Suffield students with mild disabilities tend to have more services, delivered more frequently than one would see in other districts, while students with significant disabilities appear to be placed out-of-district. The number of students placed into out-of-district schools by the district has doubled in the past two years and an increase in the number of students placed out-of-district will probably continue unless the district proactively develops quality programs for students with more significant disabilities (autism, behavior, multiply handicapped). Use of outside agencies for transition and vocational assessment services also impacts the special education budget. The lack of a high school department chair for special education and a preschool coordinator causes challenges in process and communication. The district provides a variety of professional development opportunities to staff and instructional materials and other resources for students with disabilities.

1) Special Education Budget

The Suffield Special Education Department receives funds from the Individuals with Disabilities (IDEA) grant and the district budget. IDEA funding has increased slightly over the past three years, excluding the one-time AARA funds. The majority of funds from IDEA are used to pay for staffing (administrator, teachers, and paraprofessionals). Approximately \$40,000 is also used for contracting with professional technical services such as consultants and independent evaluators. The district budget tends to increase by approximately \$200,000 each year, resulting in an increase of \$367,816 from 2008-2011. Some increase can be explained by an increase in out-of-district tuition from \$1,032,743 in 2009 to \$1,277,830 in 2010 and student transportation. The largest portion of the district budget supports salaries of speech and language pathologists, psychologists, occupational therapists, secretaries in central office and the buildings, paraprofessionals and bus monitors.

Table 8: IDEA and District Special Education Funding 2009-2012

Year	IDEA Preschool	IDEA K-12	IDEA AARA	District	Total
2011-12	\$15,502	\$436,104		\$2,640,533	\$3,092,139
2010-11	\$15,500	\$436,452	\$551,400	\$2,560,941	\$3,564,293
2009-10	\$15,487	\$410,278		\$2,454,934	\$2,880,699
2008-09	\$15,761	\$403,459		\$2,272,717	\$2,691,937
Total	\$62,250	\$1,686,293	\$551,400	\$9,929,125	\$12,229,068

2) Out-of-District Placements

A review of out-of-district placements indicate that the number of students placed out-of-district by Suffield has increased from 8 in 2008 to 22 in 2011. Suffield placed 7.4% of the special education population in 2010 which is the same as the DRG average; however if the district continues to increase the numbers of students placed out-of-district, they will soon exceed the DRG average. There are 22 students with disabilities placed by Suffield in out-of-district placements in 2011, an increase from 19 the previous year. Half (11) of students placed in out-of-district facilities are in the autism category with one preschooler, 2 in grades 4 and 5, 3 middle school students, and 5 high school students. The next highest category is students with intellectual disabilities at 4, then 3 students with attention deficit, 2 with emotional disturbance, and one with multiple disabilities. The students are spread over a number of grade levels with a variety of different disabilities. A review of possible future out-of-district placements in light of currently placed students would be useful for program planning.

3) Special Education Staffing

The review of staffing resources indicate that the ratio of student to Suffield special education staff in 2010 was higher than most districts in the DRG. Paraprofessionals had the 7th highest ratio of student to staff in the DRG with 21 districts having a better (lower) ratio. Ratio of students to special education teachers is 12th highest in the DRG, with 18 districts having a better ratio. Speech and Language has the 5th highest with 25 districts having a better ratio. In 2010 the district used a consultant to provide speech and language services (1 FTE). This position would not have shown up in the state report. Social worker and psychologists are the 12th highest, with 25 districts with a better ratio. Our reviews of special education staff caseloads and observations revealed manageable caseloads, so we are somewhat perplexed with the comparative ratio data. Either the data provided to the state is not accurate or the comparable districts have more staff that are available to work with the students with significant disabilities.

Spaulding staff universally report the limited number of administrative supports given the high number of students in the school. There is one principal with no assistant principal. The school psychologists and reading consultant serve as administrative designees when the principal is out of the building or otherwise occupied. The amount of time assigned to administer the preschool program is limited. Spaulding staff report appreciation for the high number of programs and resources they have available to them. This has been expanded in recent years with the introduction of SRBI and the use of federal grant resources. They also compliment their special education colleagues for their resourcefulness in providing materials and strategies for special education and general education students. Staff is concerned about the caseload of special education teachers and related service staff, given the number of direct service hours versus the need for them to be available for collaborative team meetings and consultation.

McAlister general and special education staff feel that for the most part, they have adequate resources to deliver services to students. A concern was raised that the technology available to students, i.e. computers, has had a set back with the loss of a computer lab and the use of laptops in its place. Staff would like to have more resources available for Tier I interventions. McAlister School has ample resources to meet the needs of the special education population as evidenced by file review, observation and focus group. Caseloads are very favorable, 9 to 11 students (as of the start of the year), per special education teacher. Paraprofessionals are used effectively and efficiently within the general education setting under the direction of the special education staff.

The high school does not have a special education department chair; there is a team leader assigned. The school does not have one central “go to” person for special education related issues. Special education staff would like more resources, such a core academic books written on difference reading levels.

Question 4 Communication and Collaboration	<i>Ed Benefit And In-depth Review</i>	<i>Classroom Observations</i>	<i>Parent Survey</i>	<i>Focus Interviews</i>
To what extent is the communication with stakeholders effective in meeting special education student needs?	X	X	X	X

Findings:

Summary: Both communication and collaboration between parents and staff and staff-to-staff was analyzed with data from in-depth student reviews, classroom observations, parent surveys and focus interviews. All schools participate in a variety of methods (email, notes, phone conversations, team meetings, PPTs, etc.) to communicate within the school and to communicate with parents. Overall, elementary and middle school staff are working well together and communicating. Lack of a special education department chair and planning time for co-teachers at the high school has resulted in less effective communication. Frequent changes in central office leadership and inconsistent application of processes across the district create uncertainty among both staff and parents regarding the district’s philosophy and direction for students with disabilities. Communication with special education staff and central office should be more frequent and focus on teaching and learning and consistency of special education processes.

Parent survey data indicate that the majority of the parents (89% and 87%) in elementary and middle school responded in agreement to questions related to satisfactory communication with staff, while 76% of preschool and high school parents were in agreement with these statements. Parent survey data indicate that the parents of children with autism are generally not as satisfied with the programs, communication and transitions. A common theme in parent focus group interviews was the importance of keeping “on top of” the schools, to ensure their child received a proper program. Some parents indicate that they have lost trust that the district will provide what is on the IEP, that they will hire qualified staff, and monitor programs for fidelity of implementation. The purpose of SPEDPAC is not clear. Parents and staff agree that the communication when students transition to a new school needs improvement. Inconsistent information is sometimes provided depending upon which administrator a person speaks to. Comments on the survey and in focus interviews indicate a complex picture of communication with parents in the district. While most building staff indicate that they did a good job in communicating with parents and the majority of parents indicated the same, there were some parents who experienced significant problems with the communication they received from the district. It is not atypical for parents to have inconsistency of experiences; however in Suffield this is more pronounced.

Spaulding

Spaulding staff describe multiple ways of communicating with parents on a regular basis including emails, phone calls, daily communication notebooks, report cards, progress reports on the IEP, observations and regularly scheduled team meetings with parents. Parents report their primary method of learning about progress is through the report card or the annual review. Preschool parents report difficulty with scheduling observations due to the requirement that a supervisor or social worker be present, since they are not in the building every day. Spaulding parents report a desire to have more data shared regarding their child’s progress rather than anecdotal information. Communication is effective among all staff, which also includes related services. Time is allocated for the different committees within the building. When decisions are made person/s are designated for follow through, the individual/s responsible are listed in meeting minutes and they are responsible for reporting back to team at the next meeting. Many parents reported poor communication regarding the lapse in speech and language services from the previous school year. Parents indicate that communication from the central office comes through required notifications and occasional presence at the Planning and Placement Team meeting. The preschool parents indicate more access to the central office special education supervisor. Parents also

report mixed communication from the administration in the school and central office regarding decisions related to the implementation of the IEP.

McAlister

At McAlister, general and special educators state that communication between them is excellent. They communicate and work together collaboratively. This was supported by classroom observations. Staff report that communication with parents occurs through conferences, scheduled meetings, notes, phone and email. The staff feel that parent communication is a strength of the school. Staff feel that communication between them and the building administration is very good. Staff does not feel as positively about communication with Central Office administration stating that questions or concerns sometimes go unanswered and they may get conflicting answers from the Central Office administrators. Staff expressed a desire to meet as a department periodically. Speech-language meets three or four times per year. Special education teachers do not meet, but the Supervisor does visit the building at least once per week. Staff would like to have a clearer line of communication with Central Office.

McAlister administration and staff feel that their communication with stakeholders is effective in meeting special education student needs. They cite a variety of ways they communicate with parents: meetings, phone calls, emails, current on line grade reporting, daily planners and notes. For parents we interviewed as part of the in-depth review, their view of communication was varied. One of three parents was very satisfied with all aspects of the communication received. Two of the three were dissatisfied with the communication from the special education staff. One of the three was dissatisfied with the communication from Central Office. The parents did note that communication has improved since their child attended McAlister.

Middle School

Communication on all levels is viewed as a strength by staff at Suffield Middle School. Parents are emailed/called by both special and general education teachers as well as related services staff. Parents in focus group interviews indicate that the communication is fairly good, but sometimes the school seems disorganized, for example this year they indicate that the student schedules were changed several times within the first month of school, causing difficulties for their children who have trouble with transitions. Two parents in the in-depth interviews indicate that communication was excellent and they praised teachers and related staff.

High School

Power School software supports communication at the High School. Staff state that they work well together, but would like a common plan time for co-teachers. The halls in the building are well labeled; there is a desk for assistance upon entry. Email and telephone are used to communicate with parents. IEP progress is mailed quarterly. Parents state they would like the PPT to run as long as necessary; not just the 45-minute allotted time. They would like the appropriate general education teachers to attend the PPT, citing an example of a PE teacher at meeting as the general education representative (no PE issues). Parents in the focus interview indicate concern that staff do not know or understand their child's IEP. One parent felt her son's success was directly related to his case manager and that she communicated with the case manager when needed. The other parent was concerned because she didn't know what was being done about her daughter's reading problem and she had asked several times. A parent of a student receiving 504 Services indicated that staff were not aware of her child's accommodation plan each year. Because her child had a significant medication condition, teachers unknowingly were putting her child in dangerous situations.

Parent Survey- Communication

Responses from the nine survey questions related to communication and collaboration indicate that the elementary and middle school parents had 89% and 87% agreement respectively. Preschool and high school parents had a 76% agreement (Table 9).

Table 9: Parent Survey Results on Communication and Collaboration

School	Communication and Collaboration
Preschool	76% agree 24% disagree
Elementary	89% agree 11% disagree
Middle School	87% agree 13% disagree
High School	76% agree 24% disagree

The highest percent of preschool parent agreement (87%) was *PPT meetings for my child have been scheduled at times and placed that met my needs.* and the questions that received the highest disagreement percent at 28% were *My concerns and recommendations are valued* and *I have received a copy of my child's IEP within 5 school days after the PPT.* Elementary parent results indicate that the highest percent agreement (93%) was with the statement *PPT meetings for my child have been scheduled at times and places that met my needs.* The highest percent of disagreement (14%) was with the statement *In my child's school, administrators and teachers encourage parent involvement.* Middle school parent results indicate that the highest percent agreement (91%) was with the statement *I understand what is discussed at meetings to develop my child's IEP.* The highest percent of disagreement (17%) was with the statement *PPT meetings have been scheduled at a time and place that met my needs.* High school parent results indicate that the highest percent agreement (89%) was with the statement *I understand what is discussed at meetings to develop my child's IEP.* The highest percent of disagreement (34%) was with the statement *I am informed about relevant information.*

Parent Involvement

Analysis of the two questions related to parent training indicate that parents agree 55% to 69% with the statements that there are opportunities for parent training and in the past year they have attended parent training or information sessions provided by the district that addressed the needs of parents and of children with disabilities. Agreement percentages were lower in the high school than the other three schools (Table 10).

Table 10: Parent Involvement

School	Parent Training
Preschool	69% agree 31% disagree
Elementary	69% agree 31% disagree
Middle School	62% agree 38% disagree
High School	55% agree 45% disagree

There are monthly SPEDPAC meetings where approximately 10-12 parents attend with some special education administrators. The purpose and meeting norms of SPEDPAC are defined differently by different members and there is some frustration among parents and staff as to how to make these meetings more meaningful. There are no building level committees where parents of students with disabilities can provide input.

Commendations

The CREC evaluation team appreciates the assistance provided by the offices of the superintendent and pupil services in conducting this review. Staff members in the buildings were very helpful in providing both time and information. Parents of students with disabilities in Suffield contributed enormously to this report through their completion of surveys and interviews with team members.

The Superintendent and the district leadership team have identified core approaches of SRBI, and differentiated instruction, along with strategies and structures that will support the work that is required to enhance educational benefit for students with disabilities. Included in these strategies and structures are school improvement plans and a district improvement plan that will increase consistency of practice across the district.

The district's records are well organized, paper work is complete and timelines appear to be met. A secretary in each school is assigned these duties and this is an apparent priority for the district. The majority of the IEPs reviewed are well written and aligned with curriculum standards, the goals and objectives meet identified needs, and the assessments are appropriate. The district is in its third year of using IEPPLUS, an electronic database system for IEPs promoting easier access to student information.

Classroom observations and in-depth reviews revealed that IEPs are implemented appropriately and students receive the services listed on the IEP. Students with disabilities are accepted in the general education classroom by their peers as evidenced by natural friendships, conversations and inclusion in activities. General and special education staff demonstrates their willingness to problem-solve and share resources and expertise. The district provides a high level of intensive services to students with disabilities that are well documented on the IEPs and delivered, as evidenced by staff and student schedules and observation. The district met state target for percent of students identified with disabilities and time with nondisabled peers and has made notable on the CMT math scores for students with disabilities. Gains in proficiency are noted in CMT and CAPT scores in all areas.

The preschool program is committed to an integrated preschool setting with a 50-50 ratio of students with disabilities and students without disabilities. At Spaulding the students are making good progress on meeting the goals and objectives identified in their IEPs, the school and classrooms have a positive culture and climate and students are highly engaged. General education teachers are comfortable with the inclusion of special education teachers and related service staff in their classroom. The school has a strong Scientific Research Based Intervention system with resources to support it.

At McAlister the early intervention process is a collaboration of all staff, but is clearly a general education initiative that utilizes special education staff in a support role rather than a primary role. The general and special education teachers work collaboratively in delivering services to special education students in a classroom setting. Special education students are well integrated into the school and included in general education classes. The transition process for students grade to grade at McAlister School is effective for special education students because staff collaborate to ensure the success of students. The care and concern that administration and staff demonstrate for all students is obvious as one observes classes and travels around the building.

The middle school has a strong positive energy throughout the building, and the mission statement "Our Learning Community Values Respect and Responsibility for All" is practiced. Special education teacher caseloads are manageable. There is a strong communication system among staff/parents about students. Programs and services for special education students operate the first day of school and plan time for co-teachers is provided. Staff are aware of student needs/strengths as stated in their IEP's. Online resources for instruction and management are provided to staff.

Special education teachers at the high school attend professional development activities to enhance their resource and intervention classes. Paraprofessionals are placed according to their strengths. General education classrooms are highly visual and display student work. General education teachers are comfortable with the inclusion of special education students in their courses. One resource room has an informative display about IEP's.

CMT and CAPT scores overall have shown improvement in the last two years.

Recommendations

Develop and implement a 3 year special education action plan that incorporates recommendations from this report. The plan should be used to inform school improvement plans and determine staff goals, supervision and monitoring activities. Special education programs and services are reliant on the practices that are used in the district for all students. Therefore, the special education plan should be supported by and part of the district and school improvement plans. We were excited to see the district's emphasis on a theory of action that includes: 1) Standards and Essential understandings for student learning for all 2) Data as the vehicle for examining progress and 3) Collaboration – as an environment to focus on learning, District practices in all these areas will benefit all students, including students with disabilities.

The superintendent will work with stakeholders to develop, monitor and communicate the plan to parents, Board of Education and staff. As the plan is implemented, the superintendent and district leadership team will use the data to continuously monitor progress and make changes in the plank as needed. It is expected that the plan will be a living document and as data dictate, changes in the plan's activities should occur.

Embedded in the 3 year strategic plan should be a **100 day plan** that addresses the high priority activities that will have the greatest impact. The CREC report provides recommendations that include activities needed to meet goals, and suggested timeframes for implementation of the activities.

Three Year Goals:

- 6) Increase the focus on teaching and learning, high quality services, and fidelity of implementation for students with disabilities.
- 7) Meet state target for all areas on CMT and CAPT for students with disabilities.
- 8) Increase opportunities within the district for students with significant disabilities to be served.
- 9) Implement and monitor consistent standards across the district for parent communication, service hours, and development of service delivery model, data collection, and analysis and sharing.
- 10) Improve transitions at all levels.
- 11) Improve communication and collaboration with parents.

Recommended Activities for 100 Day Plan (high priority and greatest impact)

Data to Inform Instruction

Data collection and analysis should be in the 100 day plan due to the impact on CMT/CAPT scores, high quality services and fidelity of implementation, improvement of collaboration and communication with parents, and consistent standards across the district. We are pleased that data as the vehicle for examining progress has been identified by the district leadership team as an important district-wide initiative. The leadership team can assess data as a “problem of practice,” and conduct structured rounds to get more information on how the district is using data to inform the instruction of students with disabilities. After implementation of the recommendation, frequent monitoring of the process will ensure fidelity of implementation. Parent and staff information sharing will be an important component of the process. A district committee representing all grade levels should regularly review CMT/CAPT scores and Curriculum Based Assessments of Students with disabilities to determine whether teaching across the district is comprehensive and aligned with student needs.

Instructional Leadership

All of the goals we identified for the special education plan relate directly to the importance of instructional leadership and so we recommend that the district review job responsibilities of administrators and realign responsibilities to provide increased time to support teaching and learning, high quality services, consistent processes, and fidelity of implementation. Increased collaboration between general education and special education with a focus on teaching and learning for all students is recommended.

Central Office Activities

Activities to support 100 day plan

- Implement a model that unites special education and general education under teaching and learning for all students.
- Develop, implement, and share special education action plan.
- Review responsibilities of central office administrators to maximize time to support teaching and learning, staff supervision and support, and fidelity of implementation.
- Special education administrators take leadership of hiring of certified special education and related services staff and utilize new hiring guidelines developed by the district.
- Shift evaluation of paraprofessionals to building administrators and share special education and related staff supervisory responsibilities between central office and building administrators. Goal meetings and end of the year evaluations should include both administrators. Special education administrators should observe all special education staff at least once during the year.
- Incorporate activities from special education action plan into school improvement plans and into staff goals and supervision.
- Conduct quarterly special education department meetings to address issues of teaching and learning particularly related to need for data collection and improved reading and writing.
- Develop, implement, and monitor standards for data collection and analysis that informs instruction.
- Analyze staffing and develop a plan to reallocate or budget for new staff to create a high school department chair, transition coordinator, and preschool coordinator.
- Use SpedPac meetings quarterly to discuss progress on action plan and get input and feedback from parents. Establish meeting norms and mission and use facilitator to assist, if needed.
- Develop district-wide committee of staff to regularly review CMT/CAPT and common assessment scores of students with disabilities to inform district-wide instruction, professional development, utilization of resources and instructional leadership

Additional activities for implementation 2011-12

- Form a committee of administrators, general and regular education staff from all five levels to develop a process to improve on the transition of special education students from level to level and to review program delivery models and services.
- Develop guidelines for service hours and service delivery model and train staff on their use.
- Work with building administrators to establish a parent advisory committee that can provide useful feedback and ideas.
- Build capacity to keep more students in-district and place fewer students out-of-district.
- Establish a protocol for evaluation of students on the autism spectrum to specifically include tools designed to evaluate students with autism in accordance with state guidelines.
- Train staff on evaluation and reevaluation of students with autism and analyze district wide services to students with autism.

Spaulding Activities

Activities to support 100 day plan

- Continue consultation to the preschool program with a focus on data collection for students with disabilities including the role of the district applied behavior analyst, re-evaluation of the “leveling” system, increased opportunities to reach out to families and the staffing structure to support the regular preschool population.
- Re-evaluate the role of the principal and special education supervisor with respect to administrative support of the preschool program, supervision and evaluation of special education staff and paraprofessionals, and assignment of paraprofessionals. In addition, the school needs clear, identified building based supports for students in crisis in the absence of the principal and special education supervisor that does not require staff to abandon direct service provision.
- Re-consider the guidelines for parent observations in classrooms that require escort by non-building based staff.
- Convene regularly scheduled meetings with the preschool parents regarding the development of the program, program changes, and how progress is documented against preschool benchmarks and IEP goals and objectives.

Additional activities for implementation 2011-12

- Provide additional training to general education and special education teachers on academic instruction in the general education setting, to decrease the reliance on special education staff as primary instructors of special education students.
- Re-evaluate the provision of speech and language services to itinerant preschool children in accordance with state guidelines.
- Re-evaluate the extended school year program for students with disabilities for continuity of service, qualifications of staff, and implementation of identified IEP goals and objectives.
- Review the opportunities staff has to discuss the transition from grade to grade and school to school. Increased time needs to be dedicated prior to the beginning of the school year for this to occur.

McAlister Activities

Activities to support 100 day plan

- Continue to develop the process for the collection, analysis and use of data by all staff to determine student progress and improve student achievement.

Additional activities for implementation 2011-12

- Administration and special education staff should meet to review the processes in place to communicate with parents as it relates to program and progress. Although there is a small sample of parents, there is a wide range of agreement on the effectiveness of communication. A larger sample of McAlister parents should be surveyed regarding communication.

Middle School Activities

Activities to support 100 day plan

- Arrange for special education students to attend and participate in their PPT meetings and provide them with the necessary skills and data to participate.

Additional activities for implementation 2011-12

- Provide professional development to special education staff and add instruction of scientifically research based learning strategies to academic labs.

Activities to support 100 day plan

- Focus on reading, math, and language arts goals aligned with the curriculum and build in frequent data collection to determine progress.
- Clearly define Targeted Intervention Course and Resource, write curriculum, and make it an accredited course. Add instruction in scientifically research based learning strategies, transition and strategies to promote student independence.
- Continue professional development for co-teaching teams and add technical assistance component. Provide professional development to staff on IEP Writing for Educational Benefit.
- Strategize with guidance, department chairs, administrators and special education staff on how the co-taught class ratios could be reduced.
- Make a plan to support students with challenges in executive functions.
- Revisit the co-teaching model, have teams work together in a professional development activity to create effective lessons and provide co-teachers weekly plan time together. Provide consultant on co-teaching to observe classrooms and give feedback.

Additional activities for implementation 2011-12

- Review criteria to identify students receiving Section 504 services, review current students to ensure that the school is using the criteria appropriately, review process for informing staff about an accommodation plan.
- Create Transition Team to explore resources and map out plans for HS and post secondary students. Expand transition services to more students.
- Improve beginning of the school year by:
 - Be prepared for services, programs, and schedules to begin the first day of the school year.
 - General education teachers receive IEP page 8 and goals and objectives and receive the 504 student accommodation plan prior to the first day of school.
 - Targeted Intervention begins immediately
 - Notify parents in the summer with the name of the case manager (special education and 504) and the case manager contacts the parent within the first week of school.
 - Strategize with guidance, department chairs, administrators, and special education how co-taught class ratios could be reduced and be strategic in choosing which students go into a co-taught class. Ensure that the delivery model has other opportunities for support in the general education classes.
- Partner and plan with the middle school to increase supportive transition services for special education students and parents.
- Expand transition services to more students.
- Assign a Special Education Department Chair at the high school.

Appendix Contents

- A: Educational Benefit File Review Protocol and Demographics (as adapted from the CT State Dept of Ed., and CA Dept of Ed.)
- B: In-depth Student Review Protocol and Demographics
- C: Observations
- D: Parent Survey and Demographics
- E: Focus Interview Demographics
- F: Staffing Ratios
- G: Out-of-district Placements
- H: District Effort to Improve Language Arts in Students with Disabilities
- I: CMT CAPT Scores

Appendix A

Educational Benefit Findings

IEP Educational Benefit Review Demographics

Note: IEPs were reviewed summer 2011. Grade reflects grade level the student will be in for 2011-12 school year.

Spaulding developed IEPs

Total number of IEPs reviewed: 8

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: no ethnicity listed for any child

3 Pre K, Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3 (3) – autism (2), OHI, SLD (2), developmental delay (on autism spectrum), autism, LD, ID. (*Grade indicates the grade the student will be in 2011*)

Results: 8 of 8 (100%) scored yes to overall IEP was reasonable calculated for educational benefit

McAlister developed IEPs

Total number of IEPs reviewed: 7

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: Grade 4 = 3, Grade 5 = 2, Grade 6 = 2. Ethnicity: White = 7. Disability: Autism = 1, Hearing Imp. = 1, LD = 2, OHI = 1, Speech = 2.

Results: number and percent of students who scored yes to Overall IEP was reasonably calculated for educational benefit: 7 = 100%

Middle School developed IEPs

Total number of IEPs reviewed: 5 SMS

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category:

Ethnicity was not noted on any IEP

Middle School: Grade 8, 1-Autism spectrum, 1-ID, 1-OHI, 2-SLD; Grade 9, 1-ED, 1-SLD, 1-SLI,

Results: 7 out of 8 (87%) scored yes to Overall IEP was reasonably calculated for educational benefit.

High School

Total number of IEPs reviewed: 10 - SHS

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: SHS

Grade 10, 1-OHI, Grade 11, 3-SLD, 1-OHI, Grade 12, 1-SLD, 4 out-of-district

Results: 8 out of 10 (80%) scored yes to Overall IEP was reasonably calculated

Appendix A

Educational Benefit Findings and Protocol

Educational Benefit Review Form (MacDonald 2007, as adapted from the CT Ed Benefit review process and the CA Ed Benefit review process)

Special Education File Review Form

District: Rocky: NFA Reviewer:

Review date:

Student Name:		Grade	Case Manager	School	Ethnicity	Gender:
SECTION A IEP Requirements		YES	NO	Comments		
IEP date: School that developed IEP:						
IEP is current						
IEP is complete						
Assistive technology to support goals						
SECTION A Total						
SECTION B EDUCATIONAL BENEFIT AREAS						
Assessment Area	Present Performance 0-3 comments	Identified Need 0-3 comments	Goals & Objectives 0-3 comments	Placement & Svcs 0-3 comments	Progress 0-3 comments	
Academic - Math						
Academic; Literacy						
Behavior / Soc. Emotional						
Communication						
Vocational / Transition						
Health & Development						
Fine and Gross Motor						
Activities of Daily Living						
Other Academics						

0=item not present 1=item present but not aligned with other items 2= item present and partially aligned with other items
 3=item present and fully aligned with other items
 NA not appropriate for item to be present

Section C	Ed Benefit Review Summary	YES	NO	Comments
	Assessment is complete			
	Assessment data identifies student need(s)			
	Present performance identifies all needs identified in assessment(s)			
	Adverse affect on Educational Performance is defined			
	All student need(s) are addressed by appropriate goals and objectives			
	Goals and Objectives are standards based, verb driven, measureable			
	Goals / objectives list the condition or specialized instruction needed to achieve goal/objective			
	Accommodations and modifications match the learning style and correspond with goals and objectives			
	Service(s) support goals and objectives			
	Types of assessment(s) were curriculum / performance based			
	Student made yearly progress			
	If did not make yearly progress, services were changed to assist student to make progress			
	Sufficient services were provided to ensure student progress			
	Presenting problems correspond with level and amount of service(s)			
	OVERALL COMPLIANCE: IEP was reasonably calculated to result in EDUCATIONAL BENEFIT			
	SECTION C Total			

Comments:

Appendix B

In-Depth Demographics and Protocol

In-depth Reviews: 11 students Pre-K to Grade 11

Spaulding

Total number of students reviewed in-depth: 4

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: Pre K itinerant speech service, Pre K – Development delay (on spectrum), Grade one – autism, Grade two – speech/language

McAlister

Total number of students reviewed in-depth: 3

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: Grade 4 = 3. Ethnicity: White = 3. Disability: Hearing Impaired = 1, LD = 1, OHI = 1.

Middle School

Total number of students reviewed in-depth: SMS, 2

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: Grade 8, Autism Spectrum and Grade 8 ID

High School

Total number of students reviewed in-depth: SHS 2

Number by grade, ethnicity, and disability category: Grade 11, OHI and Grade 9, ED

**Appendix B
In-Depth Demographics and Protocol**



Parent In-depth Interview Form

Student's Name: _____ Parent: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Interviewer: _____ School: _____ Grade: _____

Hello, my name is _____ from the Capitol Region Education Council. We have been hired by the Suffield Board of Education to review the special education programs and services. Your child's name was selected as part of a random sample for CREC to review. We will conduct a file review, parent and staff interviews, and observations in the school. I would like to ask you a few questions about _____'s educational program. This should only take 5-10 minutes and everything that you say to me will remain confidential and only the independent CREC review team will see your responses.

<p>Compliance</p> <p>Describe the process that was used to determine if your child needed special education services. Once your child was identified, what opportunities have you had to provide input into the development of his/her program? <i>For high school students only</i> How has the school worked with you, your child, and other agencies to prepare him/her for school or work after graduation?</p>
<p>Positive Impact</p> <p>Please explain how the school informs you about your child's progress. <i>Follow up question, if needed: Do you receive quarterly progress reports about your child's progress in meeting the IEP goals and objectives?</i></p> <p>Do you feel you have enough information to determine how your child is doing? If no, what else would you like to have?</p>
<p>Resources</p> <p>Is your child getting all the services listed on his/her IEP? If no please explain</p> <p>If you think your child needs additional services, such as speech therapy, what would you do?</p>
<p>Communication</p> <p>If you needed to speak to someone about a concern you have regarding your child's program or progress, who would you contact and how would you contact them?</p> <p>Have you had any contact with your child's teachers this year? If yes, what was the communication about and with whom?</p> <p>On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how would you rate the communication about your child between the special education staff and you?</p> <p>On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how would you rate the communication between Central Office Special Education and you?</p>
<p>Overall Satisfaction</p> <p>On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how would you rate the effectiveness in supporting positive learning outcomes of your child's program? If it is too soon to tell this year, please respond to the effectiveness of the program last year.</p> <p>Is there additional information you would like us to know about your child's program?</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to answer questions about your child's program. The results of the review will be provided to the Board of Education in November and the information will be available to the public at that time.</p>



Case Manager In-depth Interview Form

Student's Name: _____ Case Manager: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Interviewer: _____ School: _____ Grade: _____

Hello, my name is _____ from the Capitol Region Education Council. We have been hired by the Suffield Board of Education to review the special education programs and services. _____ (Name of student) was selected as part of a random sample for review. We will be conducting a file review, parent and staff interviews, and observations on this child. I would like to ask you a few questions about _____'s educational program. This should only take 15-20 minutes and everything that you say to me will remain confidential and only the independent CREC review team will see your responses.

Reviewer, you will need a copy of the student's schedule and the case manager's schedule

Is the student receiving the programs and services that were recommended in the IEP? If no, why not. (if you see a conflict ask the case manager about it)

As case manager how do you ensure that he/she receives all the required elements in the IEP?

For high school students only

How has the school worked with the parent and outside agencies to prepare this student for school or work after graduation? What transition service options are available to this student?

Positive Impact

What data do you use to develop and monitor goals and objectives for this student's IEP? Can you show me an example of data collection for this student?

Are you satisfied with the progress this student is making? Why? Why not? What would you do if the student were not making progress?

Resources

Do you have the resources required to implement the IEP? If no what do you need and why don't you have it?

What would you do if you needed more resources?

What do you do to prepare the student and the receiving teacher for the following year?

Communication

How effective is the communication between school personnel regarding this student? How do you communicate with staff?

Have you contacted this student's parents this year? If yes, what was the communication about?

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how would you rate the communication between you and the parent regarding this student?

Overall Satisfaction

On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how effective are the programs and services for this student in supporting positive student outcomes? If it is too soon to tell this year, please respond to the effectiveness of the program last year if you had this student.

Is there additional information you would like to make sure we are aware of regarding this student?

Thank you for taking the time to answer questions. The results of the review will be provided to the Board of Education in November.



General Education Teacher/PPS In-depth Interview Form

Student's Name: _____
 General education teacher or PPS: _____
 Date of Interview: _____ Interviewer: _____
 School: _____ Grade: _____

Hello, my name is _____ from CREC the Capitol Region Education Council. We have been hired by the Norwalk Board of Education to review the special education programs and services. _____ (Name of student) was selected as part of a random sample for review. We will conduct a file review, parent and staff interviews, and observations on this student. I would like to ask you a few questions about _____'s educational program. This should only take 15-20 minutes and everything that you say to me will remain confidential and only the independent CREC review team will see your responses.

Compliance
What input do you have in developing this student's IEP? Are you able to deliver the services and modifications listed on the IEP? If no, why not. What are they? For high school students only How has the school worked with the parent and outside agencies to prepare this student for school or work after graduation? What transition service options are available to this student?
Positive Impact
What data do you use to monitor progress on goals and objectives for this student's IEP? Can you show me an example of data collection for this student? Are you satisfied with the progress this student is making? Why? Why not? What would you do if the student were not making progress? What do you do to prepare the student and the receiving teacher for the following year?
Resources
Do you have the resources required to implement the IEP? If no what do you need and why don't you have it? What would you do if you needed more resources?
Communication
How effective is the communication between other school personnel regarding this student? What do you do to communicate? Have you contacted this student's parents this year? If yes, what was the communication about? On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how would you rate the communication between you and the parent regarding this student?
Overall Satisfaction
On a scale of 1 to 4 (1= not effective 4= very effective) how effective are the services you provide this student in supporting positive student outcomes? Is there additional information you would like to make sure we are aware of regarding this student?

Thank you for taking the time to answer questions. The results of the review will be provided to the Board of Education the middle of November and the information will be available at that time.



Suffield Special Education Program Review
In Depth Review

Student Name and DOB: _____ Grade: _____
School: _____

Reviewer: _____ Date of Review: _____

DATA

1) Files and documents (check all documents reviewed)

- Review of student’s confidential file & CREC’s file review summary
- Case manager schedule
- List of data provided by case manager (lesson plans, progress monitoring data, check sheet, communication sheet)

All services identified on the IEP are provided Y or No
Explain if no:

2) Observation (completed form attached) date, location, activity)

_____ Total points _____ out of _____ total applicable indicators given for observation

3) Staff Interview (2 completed forms attached)

A general education and special education teacher/case manager for an “included” student

OR

A special education teacher and a support staff (such as OT, PT, SLP, school psychologist, or paraprofessional) if self-contained

Names and roles of interviewed staff

1. _____
2. _____

Parent Interview (completed form attached) Name and date of interview _____

FOR REVIEWER ONLY

After reviewing all the data please rate how effective the programs and services for this student are in supporting positive learning outcomes.

- 0 = not effective
- 1 = not effective (ineffective in all areas)
- 2 = slightly effective (effective in some areas, but not most)
- 3 = moderately effective (effective in most areas)
- 4 = very effective (effective in all areas)

In-depth Review - Observation Protocol

Activity _____ Location _____ Reviewer: _____

#	Indicators	<u>Little or No Evidence</u> Score pt. = 0	<u>Sufficient Evidence</u> Score pt. = 1	Score 0 or 1	<u>Not</u> <u>Applic-</u> <u>able</u> <u>(NA)</u>
1	Location in the classroom: The student is seated within the same seating structure as the other students in the classroom.	Student is in a study carrel, separate seat apart from the reg. group, or back of the room.	Student is seated alongside typical peers in the general seating arrangement (i.e., whole class, groups, peer pairs, etc.).		
2	Instruction- Quality: A teacher (general education or special education or both) is the primary instructor for the class for the student (a paraprofessional or other adult may be available to assist the student when necessary, but the student is viewed as attentive to the teacher and the teacher is attentive to the student).	Student is being taught by a paraprofessional or special education teacher and is not part of the regular classroom instruction/lesson.	Student is receiving instruction from the teacher or there is co-teaching arrangement where shared teaching is evident.		
3	Engagement- Activity: If included :Student is engaged in the same curricular activity as the other members of the class (the material/instruction may be accommodated or the content/performance accommodated or modified for students needs but these do not change the intent or nature of the activity from the grade level standard) If self-contained: Student is engaged in the specialized activity as directed by teacher lesson plan and IEP.	If included: Student is engaged in a separate unrelated activity or different content area Student's activity is weakly connected to the grade level standard, more superficial in nature. If self-contained: The activity is unrelated to standards, IEP or meaningful instruction	Student is engaged in activity Student's activity is tied into the grade level standard but may be modified or accommodated for in accordance with his/her IEP. Student may have a reduced workload, manipulatives, simplified reading, assistive technology (AT), etc.		
4	Engagement on task: Student is actively engaged in the activity and demonstrates some level of understanding of the concept or application of the skill being instructed.	Student is off task, not attending to the teacher, preoccupied with something/someone, or self-stimulating behaviors are noted. Student has great difficulty answering questions or executing a given task. Part of a group, but not participating.	Student answers the teacher's question(s), executes a given task, demonstrates mastery orally, in writing, with manipulatives, or with the use of AT. In group setting, student actively participates w/others demonstrating mastery orally, in writing, with manipulatives, or with the use of AT.		

#	Indicators	<u>Little or No Evidence</u> Score pt. = 0	<u>Sufficient Evidence</u> Score pt. = 1	<u>Score</u> 0 or 1	<u>Not Applicable (NA)</u>
5	IEP – Goals and objectives, lesson design: The student’s IEP goals and objectives are integrated as part of the lesson design and instructional delivery.	Lesson content unrelated. Little or no evidence of scaffolding of instruction	Lesson content is directly aligned with EIP objective(s). Or, pre-teaching of skills, vocabulary, concepts are noted		
6	IEP – Supplementary aids and services: The student’s IEP supplementary aids and services, accommodations, and modifications are applied as appropriate to the curricular activity.	Absence of para support, per IEP. Lack of utilization of the instructional strategies, materials, books, equipment, AT, preferred seating, etc. as outlined in IEP. Content is not modified, if applicable. There is little or no attendance to a behavior plan, if required.	Para assistance per IEP, Student utilizes AT, materials, books, equipment, etc. as depicted in EIP for the specific subject area class. Identified instructional strategies are evident. Modifications to work, tests, time, etc. are noted, as applicable. There is adherence to a behavior plan if required for the student.		
7	IEP – Specialized instruction: Specialized instruction is evident embedded in the lessons. Either the general education teacher, the special education teacher and/or paraprofessional are provided the specialized instruction services.	Support is provided by looking of the student’s should or helping them with work.	The student is learning via <u>specific strategies aimed at promoting student independence</u> as related to the IEP goals and objectives.		
8	Paraprofessional support: Paraprofessional, if applicable, appropriately assists the student without interfering with appropriate peer assistance or developing an overdependence of the student on the assistance of the paraprofessional.	Para is positioned directly next to the student and interferes w/the teacher’s ability to directly instruct, re-clarify, question, assess or interact with the student. Para does not allow other students to assist or, the child to self-advocate for him/herself.	Para is positioned a comfortable distance from the child allowing for free interaction with peers and the teacher. Para allows the student to ask questions of the teacher or peers. The student is given the opportunity to learn by doing or to make a mistake and may require paraprofessional assistance to clarify or correct. When not needed, the paraprofessional fades from the student.		

Total points ____ out of total applicable indicators ____

Appendix C Observations Related to Educational Benefit

Spaulding Preschool

- Multiple changes in the preschool program (including location, staffing, and change in student population) over the past five years have led to some inconsistencies in and misunderstanding about the program. The program has had multiple consultants each with a different focus. The implementation of the “leveling system” was poorly communicated and has led to some mistrust with parents. In addition, staffing changes have made the current “leveling” model obsolete. Administrative oversight of the preschool program is unclear.
- The preschool has begun using a variety of data collection systems to strengthen their ability to document student growth. It is unclear of the role of the district certified applied behavior analyst in establishing programs and data collection systems.
- The preschool has a strong commitment to integrated programming for students with disabilities, including the provision of related services in the classroom setting. This has presented a challenge for the special education teachers to meet the needs of all students with and without disabilities without the input of a regular early childhood educator.

Spaulding K-2

- Programs such as Focus, Soar and SCERTS are seen as valuable resources for unique populations of students and offer a variety of alternatives for specialized intensive service for some students.
- The introduction of SRBI has expanded the use of data to monitor progress for all students. Staff is working on the collection of data for monitoring progress on IEP goals and objectives. There was a data collection system in place for each child observed as part of the in-depth review.
- In general, students with disabilities receive high levels of specialized services. These are provided in the general education setting as much as possible, though often in an isolated fashion with a special education teacher. This model requires intensive support from the special education staff, making their caseload numbers deceiving when compared to the actual service delivery hours required. It also diminishes the role of the general education teacher in providing primary academic instruction to students with disabilities. There is no co-teaching occurring in the classrooms.
- The teachers all felt they had multiple resources and materials to individualize for students, including the kindergarten and first grades having an academic support person in each class, the tutors available for Tier II and III, the reading specialist and the SOAR program for kindergarten students who needed a longer day for additional support

McAlister

- Special education students at McAlister School are receiving educational benefit based on a review of random IEP’s and files and an in-depth review of students. Observation also confirmed that special education students are offered a continuum of services between general education and the resource room setting.
- A variety of data is gathered to determine student progress and to make programming decisions. The data includes formal and informal assessments such as standardized tests, DRA, DRP, CMT’s, in class assessments and running records. Teachers meet weekly by grade level to discuss student data. Of the three parents interviewed for the in-depth review, one was completely satisfied with all aspects of the program. Two of the three parents had concerns about communication from staff, specifically relating to the sharing of data and reporting progress.
- The Wilson reading program has recently been introduced and staff report that this should result in improved reading scores.

Suffield Middle School

- Student data is collected in a variety of ways: Formal assessments, school benchmarks, CMT's, CFA's, team meetings discussion, and behavior check sheets. A special education teacher is assigned to each team so special education students are discussed at team meeting as needed; parents are brought in for team meeting if warranted. General education teachers are given pg. 8 and goals and objectives, immediately and explanations are provided from case managers as needed. Observations indicate that accommodations are in effect.
- Programs and services start immediately at the beginning of the year. Special education students that are struggling are reviewed and programs are changed during the school year, if needed.

Suffield High School

- Student data is collected from CMT's CAPT scores, quizzes, tests, scored CAPT practices, Portfolios, Triennials, CFA's, PSAT, SAT and point sheets. How the data is analyzed is unclear.
- Two teachers are currently being Wilson Reading trained to support data collection as well as instruction.
- General education teachers do not get IEP info immediately to inform them about their special education students.
- Special education teachers do not attend general education data team meetings.
- One special education teacher co-teaches an English CAPT class 14/20 (paraprofessional also) for those students who did not pass the CAPT. Math and science CAPT is offered after school.
- IEP objectives are not consistently specific and measurable and aligned with the general education curriculum standards. Words like "observation" "demonstrate" "identify" and "discuss" need to be tied to a form of measurement. Progress reporting on IEP is erratic, especially end of year reporting.
- Resource/intervention classes observed tended to focus on tutoring and helping with assignments instead of teaching independence through strategic instruction, such as learning strategies, self-advocacy skills, organization, etc.
- Overall classroom instruction that was observed (gen/sped both) was not engaging, lacked rigor, and there was no evidence of differentiated instruction or planning for such.
- Resource/Intervention classes had "time on task" issues ... students walk in late, waste time, could do in 15 minutes what takes 45. Takes too long to settle down and be productive.
- Secondary transition services are limited.

Appendix D Parent survey and Demographics



*Division of Technical
Assistance & Brokering Services*

Dear Parent(s):

The Suffield Board of Education has hired the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC) to conduct a review of the programs and services available to students with disabilities in Suffield. This study will assist Suffield now and in the future to provide quality programs and services to students with disabilities.

The review will begin in June 2011 and continue through October 2011. Over the next few months, CREC will seek information from a variety of sources, including analysis of state and local reports and documents, review of student IEPs, staff and parent interviews, and observations in each of the schools.

Parents of students receiving special education and 504 services have an important role in this review and we encourage you to participate. CREC will be collecting information from parents first through the attached **parent survey**. Parents will also be invited to attend focus group interview sessions that will occur in September and October. As part of the review, CREC will be conducting in depth student reviews on a randomly selected representative sample of students. If your child is selected for the in depth review, a member of the CREC review team will observe your child, look at work samples and the student file, speak with teachers, and contact you by phone. You will be notified in August of the dates and times scheduled for the parent focus group interviews. Focus group interview sessions will be held during the day and evening to accommodate parent schedules.

All of your responses will be confidential. Only members of the CREC review team and CREC office staff will have direct access to this information. Thank you for your valuable response.

Peg MacDonald, PH.D.
CREC Review Team Leader
Director of Technical Assistance and Brokering Services Division
mmacdonald@crec.org

If you have any questions about completing and returning the survey, please contact Jeannette Estrada at (860) 524-4038/ jestrada@crec.org

Please return the survey to CREC in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope by June 27th, 2011

Suffield Special Education Parent Survey

Please share your thoughts and experiences regarding your child's special education services **over the past 12 months**. Information from this survey will be used in the Suffield special education review conducted by the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC).

This information will not be used to identify you, your child or your family in any way. All of your responses will be confidential. Only the CREC review team and CREC office support staff will have direct access to this information.

Mark the circles below to describe your child. Please complete and return the survey in the self addressed stamped envelope by **June 27th, 2011**.



School where my child attends _____

Age	Gender	Race/Ethnicity [Choose One Only]	Grade Level
3 – 5 <input type="radio"/>	Male <input type="radio"/>	American Indian or Alaskan Native <input type="radio"/>	Pre-school <input type="radio"/>
6 – 12 <input type="radio"/>	Female <input type="radio"/>	Asian or Pacific Islander <input type="radio"/>	Elementary (includes Kindergarten) <input type="radio"/>
13 – 14 <input type="radio"/>		Black not Hispanic <input type="radio"/>	Middle <input type="radio"/>
15 – 17 <input type="radio"/>		Hispanic <input type="radio"/>	High <input type="radio"/>
18 – 21 <input type="radio"/>		White not Hispanic <input type="radio"/>	Transition/18-21 yrs. <input type="radio"/>

Primary Eligibility for Services [Choose One Only; Eligibility is listed on Page 1 of your child's IEP]	
Autism <input type="radio"/>	Orthopedic Impairment <input type="radio"/>
Deaf-Blindness <input type="radio"/>	Other Health Impairment (OHI) <input type="radio"/>
	ADD/ADHD? <input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Developmental Delay (ages 3-5 only) <input type="radio"/>	Speech or Language Impaired <input type="radio"/>
Emotional Disturbance <input type="radio"/>	Traumatic Brain Injury <input type="radio"/>
Hearing Impairment <input type="radio"/>	Visual Impairment <input type="radio"/>
Intellectual Disability <input type="radio"/>	To Be Determined <input type="radio"/>
Specific Learning Disabilities <input type="radio"/>	504 Services only <input type="radio"/>
Multiple Disabilities <input type="radio"/>	Other _____ <input type="radio"/>

Type of Placement [Choose One Only]	
Public School <input type="radio"/>	Out-of-State <input type="radio"/>
Out-of-District Special Education School <input type="radio"/>	Hospital/Homebound <input type="radio"/>
Residential School <input type="radio"/>	Other _____ <input type="radio"/>
Private/Parochial <input type="radio"/>	(Please describe) <input type="radio"/>

<i>Special Education Parent Survey</i>	STRONGLY Agree	MODERATELY Agree	SLIGHTLY Agree	SLIGHTLY Disagree	MODERATELY Disagree	STRONGLY Disagree	DON'T KNOW	NOT APPLICABLE
Satisfaction with My Child's Program OVER THE PAST 12 MONTHS								
1. I am satisfied with my child's overall special education program over the past 12 months.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
2. I have the opportunity to talk to my child's teachers on a regular basis to discuss my questions and concerns.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
3. My child is accepted within the school community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
4. My child's IEP is meeting his or her educational needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. All special education services identified in my child's IEP have been provided.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Staff is appropriately trained and able to provide my child's specific program and services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Special education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated on my child's IEP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. General education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated on my child's IEP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. General education and special education teachers work together to assure that my child's IEP is being implemented.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Data on my child's progress is used to inform instruction and that data is shared with me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication and Collaboration								
11. In my child's school, administrators and teachers encourage parent involvement in order to improve services and results for children with disabilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
12. I understand what is discussed at meetings to develop my child's IEP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
13. My concerns and recommendations are valued.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
14. PPT meetings for my child have been scheduled at times and places that met my needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
15. I have received a copy of my child's IEP within 5 school days after the PPT.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
16. The central office special education staff have been helpful in getting my child necessary services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
17. The building administrators have been helpful in getting my child necessary services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

<i>Special Education Parent Survey</i>	STRONGLY Agree	MODERATELY Agree	SLIGHTLY Agree	SLIGHTLY Disagree	MODERATELY Disagree	STRONGLY Disagree	DON'T KNOW	NOT APPLICABLE
18. I am informed about relevant information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. The school district proposed the regular classroom for my child as the first placement option.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child Participation								
20. My child has the opportunity to participate in school-sponsored activities such as field trips, assemblies and social events (dances, sports events).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
21. My child has the opportunity to participate in extracurricular school activities such as sports or clubs with children without disabilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
22. My child is considered a member of the school community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
Transition								
<i>Answer only if your child has transitioned from early intervention (Birth to Three System) to Preschool in the past 3 years.</i>								
23. I am satisfied with the school district's transition activities that took place when my child left Birth to Three.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
<i>Answer only if your child is 15 years or older.</i>								
24. I am satisfied with the secondary transition services provided to prepare my child for movement from school to post school activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
25. I am satisfied with the transition process when my child moves from one school to another or from one grade to another.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

Parent Training								
26. There are opportunities for parent training or information sessions regarding special education provided by my child's school district.	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>					
27. In the past year, I have attended parent training or information sessions provided by my district that addressed the needs of parents and of children with disabilities.	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>					
My Child's Skills								
28. My child is learning skills that will enable him/her to be as independent as possible.	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>					
29. My child is learning skills that will lead to a high school diploma, further education, or a job.	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>					

COMMENTS: Please comment on your experience with your child's special education program. These comments may refer to your experiences overall and are not limited to the past 12-months (use the reverse side of this page, if more space is needed)

Parent Survey

Ten surveys indicated that they were from a parent of a student receiving 504 services, 143 indicated that they were parents of a student receiving special education services, and 18 did not indicate what services their child received. 43 surveys were from parents of high school students, 54 from parents of middle school students, 46 from elementary, 22 from preschool parents, and six parents did not provide grade level. Parents with children in the following disability categories responded to the survey:

Autism- 33, Health Impaired (includes ADHD) – 29, No answer-29, Speech and Language- 18, Specific Learning Disability-17, Other- 18, Hearing Impaired-11, Intellectually Disabled-5, Low Incidence-5 (Deaf and Blind, Multiple Disabilities), Orthopedically Impaired-3, Developmental Delay-1, Emotional Disturbance-1, and TBI-1.

Largest percent agree by question

Largest percent disagree by question

Preschool

Preschool Questions 1-10 Satisfaction with My Child’s Program

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	48%	21%	7%	76%	11%	6%	6%	24%
1	41%	27%	5%	73%	9%	9%	9%	27%
2	45%	23%	5%	73%	23%	5%	0%	28%
3	52%	19%	14%	85%	10%	5%	0%	15%
4	43%	24%	5%	72%	10%	5%	14%	29%
5	50%	18%	5%	73%	9%	5%	14%	28%
6	55%	20%	5%	80%	10%	5%	5%	20%
7	52%	14%	19%	85%	10%	10%	0%	20%
8	50%	25%	6%	81%	13%	6%	0%	18%
9	50%	22%	5%	77%	11%	11%	0%	22%
10	43%	19%	10%	72%	10%	5%	14%	29%

Preschool Questions 11-19 Communication and Collaboration

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	52%	18%	6%	76%	11%	5%	8%	24%
11	52%	14%	10%	76%	10%	5%	10%	25%
12	59%	14%	5%	78%	18%	5%	0%	23%
13	50%	18%	5%	73%	9%	5%	14%	28%
14	64%	18%	5%	87%	9%	5%	0%	14%
15	45%	23%	5%	73%	9%	5%	14%	28%
16	43%	29%	5%	77%	10%	5%	10%	25%
17	48%	19%	10%	77%	10%	5%	10%	25%
18	50%	23%	5%	78%	9%	5%	9%	23%
19	57%	0%	14%	71%	14%	7%	7%	28%

Preschool Questions 20-22 Child Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	62%	3%	14%	79%	14%	7%	0%	21%
20	69%	0%	13%	82%	13%	6%	0%	18%
21	50%	0%	20%	70%	20%	10%	0%	30%
22	63%	6%	13%	82%	13%	6%	0%	19%

Preschool Questions 23 Birth-to-Three Transition

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
23	56%	11%	11%	78%	0%	11%	11%	22%

Preschool Questions 26-27 Parent Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	34%	14%	21%	69%	0%	7%	24%	31%
26	38%	13%	25%	76%	0%	6%	19%	24%
27	31%	15%	15%	61%	0%	8%	31%	39%

Preschool Questions 28-29 My Child's Skills

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	63%	6%	17%	86%	2%	6%	6%	14%
28	61%	6%	17%	86%	6%	2%	6%	14%
29	65%	6%	18%	89%	0%	6%	5%	11%

Elementary

Elementary Questions 1-10 Satisfaction with My Child's Program

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total of questions	54%	25%	7%	86%	4%	6%	4%	14%
1	56%	25%	6%	87%	4%	3%	6%	13%
2	65%	20%	4%	89%	4%	3%	4%	11%
3	46%	30%	11%	87%	4%	3%	4%	13%
4	48%	32%	9%	89%	5%	4%	2%	11%
5	48%	30%	7%	85%	7%	6%	2%	15%
6	42%	31%	11%	84%	7%	7%	2%	16%
7	63%	21%	5%	89%	2%	7%	2%	11%
8	54%	20%	7%	81%	5%	11%	4%	19%
9	57%	26%	5%	88%	3%	7%	2%	12%
10	57%	17%	9%	83%	1%	7%	9%	17%

Elementary Questions 11-19 Communication and Collaboration

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total of questions	61%	17%	11%	89%	4%	3%	4%	11%
11	57%	20%	9%	86%	2%	3%	9%	14%
12	61%	20%	9%	90%	6%	0%	4%	10%
13	60%	19%	9%	88%	4%	2%	6%	12%
14	61%	23%	9%	93%	5%	0%	2%	7%
15	70%	9%	12%	91%	2%	2%	5%	9%
16	59%	20%	11%	90%	4%	4%	2%	10%
17	59%	20%	12%	91%	2%	5%	2%	9%
18	54%	20%	15%	89%	4%	3%	4%	11%
19	71%	8%	13%	92%	3%	2%	3%	8%

Elementary Questions 20-22 Child Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	78%	9%	6%	93%	6%	1%	0%	7%
20	79%	5%	2%	86%	2%	2%	0%	4%
21	67%	12%	7%	86%	2%	2%	0%	4%
22	63%	10%	7%	80%	7%	13%	0%	20%

Elementary Questions 23-24 Transition

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	28%	14%	29%	71%	0%	14%	15%	29%
23	20%	10%	0%	30%	0%	0%	50%	50%
24	25%	13%	0%	28%	0%	13%	25%	38%

Elementary Questions 26-27 Parent Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	32%	19%	18%	69%	12%	3%	16%	31%
26	32%	26%	16%	74%	16%	3%	8%	26%
27	32%	11%	22%	65%	8%	3%	24%	35%

Elementary Questions 28-29 My Child's Skills

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	50%	20%	14%	84%	8%	5%	4%	16%
28	44%	29%	12%	85%	5%	5%	5%	15%
29	56%	10%	15%	81%	10%	5%	4%	19%

Middle School

Middle School Questions 1-10 Satisfaction with My Child's Program

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total of questions	41%	35%	10%	87%	6%	2%	5%	13%
1	41%	37%	6%	84%	10%	0%	6%	16%
2	43%	30%	15%	88%	7%	2%	4%	12%
3	33%	42%	11%	86%	7%	0%	7%	14%
4	37%	35%	18%	90%	4%	2%	4%	10%
5	43%	35%	10%	88%	6%	0%	6%	12%
6	45%	35%	10%	90%	6%	0%	4%	10%
7	43%	37%	6%	86%	8%	0%	6%	14%
8	42%	38%	6%	86%	8%	2%	4%	14%
9	41%	38%	11%	90%	4%	2%	4%	10%
10	43%	33%	7%	83%	4%	6%	7%	17%

Middle School Questions 11-19 Communication and Collaboration

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	43%	34%	10%	87%	5%	2%	6%	13%
11	38%	35%	12%	85%	1%	4%	10%	15%
12	51%	32%	8%	91%	3%	0%	6%	9%
13	43%	39%	9%	90%	3%	0%	7%	10%
14	42%	33%	8%	83%	7%	2%	8%	17%
15	48%	31%	10%	89%	5%	2%	4%	11%
16	38%	36%	11%	85%	4%	2%	9%	15%
17	36%	39%	14%	89%	5%	2%	5%	11%
18	39%	33%	14%	86%	4%	4%	6%	14%
19	54%	28%	8%	90%	6%	0%	4%	10%

Middle School Questions 20-21 Child Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	58%	22%	9%	89%	5%	2%	4%	11%
20	59%	23%	9%	91%	5%	0%	5%	9%
21	62%	19%	6%	87%	8%	2%	4%	13%
22	54%	23%	13%	90%	4%	2%	4%	10%

Middle School Questions Parent Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total of questions	28%	22%	12%	62%	7%	12%	19%	38%
26	33%	29%	7%	69%	10%	7%	14%	31%
27	23%	15%	15%	53%	5%	18%	23%	47%

Middle School Questions 28-29 My Child's Skills

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	49%	21%	14%	84%	5%	5%	6%	16%
28	49%	21%	13%	83%	5%	6%	6%	17%
29	49%	21%	15%	85%	5%	4%	6%	15%

High School

Category Satisfaction with Child's Program

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	18%	33%	24%	75%	7%	10%	8%	25%
1	14%	35%	19%	68%	7%	13%	12%	32%
2	19%	40%	19%	78%	12%	5%	5%	22%
3	29%	31%	21%	81%	10%	7%	2%	19%
4	14%	35%	23%	72%	7%	14%	7%	28%
5	16%	44%	19%	79%	2%	7%	12%	21%
6	20%	29%	24%	73%	7%	8%	12%	27%
7	26%	37%	24%	87%	5%	3%	5%	13%
8	15%	26%	36%	77%	5%	10%	8%	23%
9	13%	29%	32%	74%	5%	13%	8%	26%
10	15%	25%	23%	63%	10%	17%	10%	37%

Category: Communication and Collaboration

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	27%	23%	26%	76%	8%	10%	6%	24%
11	19%	21%	33%	73%	11%	14%	2%	27%
12	37%	26%	26%	89%	2%	7%	2%	11%
13	19%	28%	28%	75%	9%	9%	7%	25%
14	33%	19%	21%	73%	4%	14%	9%	27%
15	40%	19%	21%	80%	8%	7%	5%	20%
16	14%	19%	38%	71%	5%	16%	8%	29%
17	19%	25%	25%	69%	15%	8%	8%	31%
18	19%	21%	26%	66%	15%	7%	12%	34%
19	42%	34%	11%	87%	2%	8%	3%	13%

Category: Child Participation

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	44%	29%	14%	87%	4%	6%	3%	13%
20	47%	32%	11%	90%	2%	5%	3%	10%
21	42%	28%	14%	85%	5%	8%	3%	16%
22	43%	27%	19%	89%	3%	5%	3%	11%

Category: Secondary Transition

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	13%	32%	15%	60%	17%	16%	8%	40%
24	11%	32%	16%	59%	10%	21%	11%	41%
25	16%	32%	16%	64%	22%	11%	5%	36%

Category: Parent Training

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	16%	16%	23%	55%	9%	8%	28%	45%
26	16%	19%	31%	66%	12%	6%	16%	34%
27	16%	13%	16%	45%	5%	9%	41%	55%

Category: My Child's Skills

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Total agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Total disagree
Total	25%	30%	27%	82%	6%	6%	7%	18%
28	26%	26%	29%	81%	6%	9%	6%	19%
29	25%	33%	25%	83%	6%	3%	8%	17%

Parents of Children with Autism

33 parents of children with autism responded to the survey
 Preschool=4, Elementary = 5, Middle school=15, High school=4

School	Satisfaction with Child's Program		Child Participation		Child's Skills	
Pre K	All parents 76% agree 24% disagree	Parents of children with autism 63% agree 37% disagree	All parents 79% agree 21% disagree	Parents of children with autism 73% agree 27% disagree	All parents 86% agree 14% disagree	Parents of children with autism 40% agree 60% disagree
Elemen.	86% agree 14% disagree	100% agree 0% disagree	93% agree 7% disagree	100% agree 0% disagree	84% agree 16% disagree	70% agree 30% disagree
Middle School	87% agree 13% disagree	83% agree 17% disagree	89% agree 11% disagree	71% agree 29% disagree	84% agree 16% disagree	75% agree 25% disagree
High School	75% agree 25% disagree	28% agree 72% disagree	87% agree 13% disagree	67% agree 33% disagree	82% agree 18% disagree	20% agree 80% disagree

Preschool

Satisfaction with My Child's Program Over the Past 12 Months	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total of 10 questions	63%	37%	0%	8%
1. I am satisfied with my child's overall special education program over the past 12 months.	60%	40%	0%	0%
2. I have the opportunity to talk to my child's teachers on a regular basis.	60%	40%	0%	0%
3. My child is accepted within the school community.	80%	20%	0%	0%
4. My child's IEP is meeting his or her educational needs.	60%	40%	0%	20%
5. All special education services identified in my child's IEP have been provided.	60%	40%	0%	20%
6. Staff is appropriately trained and able to provide my child's specific program and services.	60%	40%	0%	20%
7. Special education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated in my child's IEP.	60%	40%	0%	0%
8. General education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated in my child's IEP.	75%	25%	0%	0%
9. General education and special education teachers work together to assure that my child's IEP is being implemented.	60%	40%	0%	0%
10. Data on my child's progress is used to inform instruction and that data is shared with me.	60%	40%	0%	20%

Communication and Collaboration	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total of 9 Questions	72%	28%	5%	7%
11. In my child's school, administrators and teachers encourage parent involvement.	60%	40%	0%	20%
12. I understand what is discussed at meetings to develop my child's IEP.	80%	20%	20%	0%
13. My concerns and recommendations are valued.	60%	40%	0%	20%
14. PPT meetings for my child have been scheduled at times and placed that met my needs.	80%	20%	0%	0%
15. I have received a copy of my child's IEP within 5 school days after the PPT.	80%	20%	20%	0%
16. The central office special education staff has been helpful in getting my child the necessary services.	80%	20%	0%	0%
17. The building administrators have been helpful in getting my child the necessary services.	80%	20%	0%	0%
18. I am informed about relevant information	80%	20%	0%	0%
19. The school district proposed the regular classroom for my child as the first placement option.	33%	67%	0%	33%

Child Participation	Percent Percent agree	percent Percent disagree	strongly Strongly agree	strongly Strongly disagree
Total of 2 questions	73%	27%	9%	0%
My child has the opportunity to participate in school sponsored activities such as field trips, assemblies and social events.	67%	33%	33%	0%
My child has the opportunity to participate in extracurricular school activities.	50%	50%	0%	0%
My child is considered a member of the school community.	67%	33%	0%	0%

Transition preschool one response= strongly agree

Parent Involvement	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total 2 questions	50%	50%	0%	50%
There are opportunities for parent training or information sessions regarding special education provided by my child's school district...	50%	50%	0%	50%
In the past year, I have attended parent training or information sessions provided by my district that addressed the needs of parents and of children with disabilities.	50%	50%	0%	50%

My Child's Skills	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total 2 questions	40%	60%	0%	40%
My child is learning skills that will enable him/her to be as independent as possible.	33%	67%	0%	33%
My child is learning skills that will lead to a high school diploma, further education, or a job.	50%	50%	0%	50%

Elementary

Satisfaction with My Child's Program Over the Past 12 Months	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total	100%	0%	58%	0%
1	100%	0%	50%	0%
2	100%	0%	50%	0%
3	100%	0%	40%	0%
4	100%	0%	60%	0%
5	100%	0%	60%	0%
6	100%	0%	40%	0%
7	100%	0%	80%	0%
8	100%	0%	80%	0%
9	100%	0%	60%	0%
10	100%	0%	60%	0%

Communication	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total	100%	0%	53%	0%
11	100%	0%	60%	0%
12	100%	0%	40%	0%
13	100%	0%	80%	0%
14	100%	0%	60%	0%
15	100%	0%	80%	0%
16	100%	0%	25%	0%
17	100%	0%	25%	0%
18	100%	0%	40%	0%
19	100%	0%	60%	0%

Elementary Participation	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total	100%	0%	60%	0%
20	100%	0%	60%	0%
21	100%	0%	60%	0%
22	100%	0%	60%	0%

Parent Involvement	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total	80%	20%	30%	10%
26	80%	20%	20%	0%
27	80%	20%	40%	20%

Child's skills	Percent agree	Percent disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Total	70%	30%	50%	0%
28	80%	20%	40%	0%
29	60%	40%	60%	0%

Middle School

Satisfaction with program	Agree	Total disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Total	83%	17%	8%	22%
1	87%	13%	7%	27%
2	81%	13%	6%	25%
3	87%	13%	7%	13%
4	87%	13%	7%	13%
5	80%	20%	7%	27%
6	85%	15%	8%	31%
7	79%	21%	7%	21%
8	77%	23%	8%	23%
9	86%	14%	7%	21%
10	80%	20%	13%	20%

Communication	Agree	Total disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Total	73%	27%	13%	49%
11	73%	27%	13%	13%
12	73%	27%	13%	20%
13	80%	20%	13%	13%
14	67%	33%	13%	20%
15	80%	20%	7%	7%
16	71%	29%	14%	14%
17	80%	20%	13%	13%
18	73%	27%	13%	13%
19	58%	33%	17%	17%

Child participation	Agree	Total disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Total	71%	29%	7%	27%
20	79%	21%	7%	36%
21	62%	38%	8%	23%
22	71%	29%	7%	21%

Parent Involvement	Agree	Total disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Total	45%	55%	18%	23%
26	55%	45%	9%	27%
27	36%	64%	27%	18%

Child skills	Total agree	Total disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Total	75%	25%	10%	0%
28	70%	30%	10%	0%
29	80%	20%	10%	0%

High School

Satisfaction with my child's program	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree
Total	28%	8%	8%	72%
1	50%	0%	0%	50%
2	25%	0%	0%	75%
3	25%	0%	0%	75%
4	25%	0%	0%	75%
5	25%	0%	25%	75%
6	25%	0%	25%	75%
7	25%	0%	0%	75%
8	25%	0%	0%	75%
9	25%	0%	0%	75%
10	25%	0%	25%	75%

Communication and Collaboration	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree
Total	36%	3%	3%	64%
11	25%	0%	0%	75%
12	50%	25%	0%	50%
13	50%	0%	0%	50%
14	50%	0%	0%	50%
15	25%	0%	25%	75%
16	33%	0%	0%	67%
17	33%	0%	0%	67%
18	33%	0%	0%	67%
19	25%	0%	0%	75%

My Child's Participation	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree
Total	67%	22%	0%	33%
20	67%	33%	0%	33%
21	67%	33%	0%	33%
22	67%	0%	0%	33%

Secondary transition	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree
Total	20%	0%	40%	80%
24	0%	0%	50%	100%
25	50%	0%	0%	50%

Parent Involvement	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree
Total	50%	25%	0%	50%
	50%	25%	0%	50%
	50%	25%	0%	50%

My Child's Skills	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree
Total	50%	0%	0%	50%
	50%	0%	0%	50%
	50%	0%	0%	50%

Appendix E Focus Interview Demographics

84 staff, 3 consultants, and 45 parents were interviewed= 132

Central Office

Total number interviewed = 4: 2 special education administrators, superintendent, and business manager

Spaulding

Total number of staff interviewed: 23

Number by title re # gen education, sped , paraprofessionals, administrators, Principal, 2 psychologists – job share – one FTE, 2 pre-k sp ed teachers, 3 sp ed teachers – K, 1 and 2, 1 OT, 1 PT, 2 SLP, 7 gen ed teachers including art and PE, 4 paraprofessionals, and 1 outside consultant

McAlister

Total number of staff interviewed: 10

Number by title re # gen ed, sped , paraprofessionals, administrators: SPED = 3, Pupil Personnel Services = 2, General Education = 5

Suffield Middle School

Total number of staff interviewed: 32

Number by title re # gen ed, sped, para's, administrators 2, Para's 3, Gen.Ed. 7, SAM 6, Sp.Ed. 8, SRBI 6

Suffield High School

Total number of staff interviewed: 16

Number by title re # gen ed, sped, para's, administrators

Special Ed Teachers 3/5 60% present (2 T's were at Wilson training both days),

Guidance/School Psychologists 4, Administration 3, Paraprofessionals (Principal could not arrange a meeting due to scheduling) 7 in building, General Ed. Teachers 6

Appendix F Staffing Ratios
Special Education Teacher Ratio

Special Education Teacher FTE					
District	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Total Student Enrollment 2010-11	Ratio #Student to One Staff
Andover	3	3	3.0	303	101
Barkhamstead	2.14	3	3.0	345	115
Bethany	6	7.0	7.0	504	72
Bolton	6.6	7.1	7.1	842	119
Canton	14.8	15.8	15.4	1777	115
Columbia	6	5.0	5.0	758	152
Cornwall	2	1.0	1.0	119	119
Ellington	22.6	22.6	22.6	2731	121
Essex	6.5	8	8.0	550	69
Hebron	10	11	11.0	1075	98
Mansfield	17	16	14.0	1238	88
Marlborough	5	5	5.0	654	131
New Hartford	7.17	7.1	7.5	595	79
Oxford	16.3	17.2	17.8	2225	125
Pomfret	4	4.0	4.0	707	177
Salem	4.5	4.5	4.2	723	172
Sherman	3.83	4.0	5.83	567	97
Somers	16.8	14.8	17.8	1629	92
Suffield	19	17.0	21.5	2406	112
Tolland	27.1	24.06	27.1	3081	114
Region 4	10	9.0	10.0	985	99
Region 7	14.67	14.3	14.29	1084	76
Region 8	23	22.6	21.6	1845	85
Region 10	25.9	27.4	27.9	2748	98
Region 12	11.7	13.2	13.9	899	65
Region 13	20	18.8	20	2038	102
Region 14	18.3	22.2	21.2	1850	87
Region 17	26.5	25.5	23.5	2448	104
Region 18	19	19.0	20	1471	74
Region 19	13.4	13.4	13.4	1149	86
Analysis	2010-11 Suffield has the twelfth highest ratio of students to special education staff in the DRG. Eighteen districts in the DRG have a lower ratio				

Appendix F Staffing Ratios

Speech and Language Pathologist Ratio

Speech-Language FTE					
District	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Total Student Enrollment 2010-11	Ratio #Students to One Staff
Andover	1	1	1.0	303	303
Barkhamstead	0.73	0.83	0.9	345	367
Bethany	1	3.0	2.0	504	252
Bolton	2	2	2	842	421
Canton	2.6	2.6	2.6	1777	683
Columbia	2	2.0	1.6	758	474
Cornwall	0	0.0	0.5	119	238
Ellington	4.6	3.6	3.8	2731	719
Essex	1.4	1.5	2.5	550	220
Hebron	3.9	3.9	3.9	1075	276
Mansfield	4	4	4.0	1238	310
Marlborough	1.5	1	1.0	654	654
New Hartford	1	1.39	1.76	595	338
Oxford	2.5	3	3	2225	742
Pomfret	1	1.0	1.0	707	707
Salem	1.5	1.4	1.2	723	603
Sherman	1.33	1.3	1.32	567	430
Somers	4.45	3.45	3.45	1629	472
Suffield	4	4.0	3	2406	802
Tolland	6	6	6	3081	514
Region 4	0	0.0	0.5	985	1970
Region 7	0	0	0.61	1084	1777
Region 8	1	1	1	1845	1845
Region 10	3.5	3.5	3.5	2748	785
Region 12	2	2.45	2	899	450
Region 13	5.8	5.8	6.1	2038	334
Region 14	3.9	3.9	3.5	1850	529
Region 17	2	3.6	3.5	2448	699
Region 18	4.2	4.2	4.2	1471	350
Region 19	1	1	1	1149	1149
Analysis	2010-11 Suffield has the fifth highest ratio of students to SLP's in the DRG.				

	2009-10			2010-11			Total Student Enrollment 2010-11	Ratio #Students to One Staff
Total Psy/SW	Psychologist	Soc. Work	Total Psy/SW	Psychologist	Soc. Work	Total Psy/SW		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303	0
1.2	0.8	0.4	1.2	0.94	0.16	1.1	345	314
1.4	1.4	0.0	1.4	0.8	0	0.8	504	630
3.3	1.5	1.6	3.1	1.5	2.4	3.9	842	216
4.6	3.8	1	4.8	3.8	1	4.8	1777	370
2	1.0	1.0	2	1.0	1.0	2.0	758	379
0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.9	0	0.9	119	132
5.6	4.0	1.0	5	4	1	5.0	2731	546
1	1	0	1	1.2	0	1.2	550	458
2	2	0	2	2.0	0	2.0	1075	538
4	4	0	4	4.0	0	4.0	1238	310
3	2	1	3	2.0	1.0	3.0	654	218
2	2	0	2	2	0	2.0	595	298
5	4	1	5	4	0.5	4.5	2225	494
1	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	707	1414
0.3	0.5	0	0.5	1	0	1.0	723	723
0.8	0.8	0.0	0.8	0.8	0	0.8	567	709
3.48	2	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3.5	1629	465
4.8	3.8	1.1	4.85	4	1	5.0	2406	481
4	4	0	4	4	0	4.0	3081	770
2.11	6.0	1.5	7.51	0.6	1.0	1.6	985	616
3	2	1	3	2	1	3.0	1084	361
3	3	0	3	3	0	3.0	1845	615
7	6	1	7	6	1	7.0	2748	393
2.51	1.51	1	2.51	1.51	1	2.5	899	358
8.1	4.8	3.3	8.1	4.8	3.3	8.1	2038	252
6.8	4	3.8	7.8	4	3	7.0	1850	264
6.4	5	1.8	6.8	4.8	1.8	6.6	2448	371
5	5.8	0.0	5.8	3.4	0	3.4	1471	433
2	1	1	2	1	1	2.0	1149	575

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES GRADES K-12 PREVALENCE DATA															
DISTRICT	YEAR	LD	ID		ED		SLI		OHI		AU		OD	SWD TOTAL	TOTAL ENROLLMENT K12
		%	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	
Andover	2010 - 11	2.0	1.0		0.0		2.0		1.0		0.7		0.7	7.3	303
Barkhamsted	2010 - 11	4.1	0.0		0.0		4.1		0.9		0.6		0.6	10.1	345
Bethany	2010 - 11	5.4	0.6		0.2		3.4		1.6		0.8		0.6	12.5	504
Bolton	2010 - 11	2.5	1.1		1.4		1.1		2.5		0.5		0.6	9.6	842
Canton	2010 - 11	3.2	0.4		0.5		0.8		2.0		1.2		0.5	8.6	1777
Columbia	2010 - 11	2.1	0.3		0.4		2.0		2.1		0.3		0.8	7.9	758
Cornwall	2010 - 11	5.0	0.0		0.0		2.5		1.7		4.2		3.4	16.8	119
Ellington	2010 - 11	4.3	0.2		0.9		1.3		1.0		0.7		1.3	9.7	2731
Essex	2010 - 11	1.8	0.0		0.2		2.9		0.9		1.3		0.4	7.5	550
Hebron	2010 - 11	2.9	0.1		0.2		3.9		1.4		0.7		0.3	9.5	1075
Mansfield	2010 - 11	4.7	0.2		0.4		2.2		2.0		1.1		1.3	11.9	1238
Marlborough	2010 - 11	2.4	0.2		0.5		0.8		0.9		0.3		0.5	5.5	654
New Hartford	2010 - 11	1.7	0.0		0.7		4.7		2.0		0.5		1.0	10.6	595
Oxford	2010 - 11	2.4	0.4		0.1		0.9		0.9		0.9		0.5	6.2	2225
Pomfret	2010-11	4.4	0.8		0.4		3.7		0.6		1.6		0.4	11.9	707
Salem	2010 - 11	3.0	0.7		0.4		0.7		1.8		1.1		0.8	8.6	723
Sherman	2010 - 11	3.9	0.2		0.2		2.3		2.3		1.2		1.2	11.3	567
Somers	2010 - 11	3.5	0.4		0.7		2.6		1.0		0.8		0.7	9.8	1629
Tolland	2010 - 11	3.8	0.4		0.9		1.2		1.8		1.5		0.7	10.3	3081
Region 4	2010 - 11	6.5	0.3		0.5		1.5		3.2		1.3		0.3	13.7	985
Region 7	2010 - 11	4.0	0.3		1.8		1.2		2.8		1.1		0.4	11.5	1084
Region 8	2010 - 11	5.3	0.6		1.4		0.9		4.0		0.8		0.2	13.1	1845
Region 10	2010 - 11	3.1	0.3		1.0		1.2		1.5		1.2		0.7	8.9	2748
Region 12	2010 - 11	4.8	0.6		0.4		3.0		2.9		1.1		1.0	13.8	899
Region 13	2010-11	4.7	0.4		0.6		3.1		2.8		1.5		0.3	16.4	2038

DISTRICT	YEAR	LD	ID	ED	SLI	OHI	AU	OD	SWD Total	TOTAL ENROLLMENT K12
Region 14	2010 - 11	4.1	0.3	0.4	3.3	2.5	1.6	0.5	12.8	1850
Region 17	2010 - 11	4.1	0.4	1.1	1.9	2.2	1.3	0.7	11.7	2448
Region 18	2010 - 11	3.9	0.5	0.5	2.2	1.0	0.8	0.7	9.7	1471
Region 19	2010 - 11	5.6	1.0	2.0	1.6	4.8	0.7	0.9	16.4	1149
Suffield	2010 - 11	3.9	0.5	0.3	1.9	1.5	1.5	0.4	9.9	2406
	2009 - 10	4.5	0.5	0.3	2.1	1.4	1.3	0.4	10.5	2427
	2008 - 09	4.2	0.7	0.5	2.0	1.7	1.1	0.2	10.4	2444
DRG C	2010 - 11	3.8	0.4	0.7	1.9	1.9	1.1	0.7	10.5	39346
	2009 - 10	3.9	0.4	0.7	2.1	1.9	1.0	0.7	10.5	39555
	2008 - 09	4.1	0.4	0.7	2.2	1.9	0.9	0.6	10.8	39880
State	2010 - 11	3.9	0.4	1.0	2.2	2.1	1.1	0.9	11.6	548052
	2009 - 10	3.9	0.5	1.0	2.2	2.1	1.0	0.9	11.6	551461
	2008 - 09	3.9	0.5	1.0	2.3	2.1	0.8	0.9	11.6	555411
Suffield Rank from highest 2010-11										
To All		14	9	22	17	19	4	23	17	
To DRG AVE.		Higher	Higher	Lower	Same	Lower	Higher	Lower	Lower	
To State		Same	Higher	Lower	Lower	Lower	Higher	Lower	Lower	
2009-10										
To DRG AVE.		Higher	Higher	Lower	Same	Lower	Higher	Lower	Lower	
To State		Higher	Same	Lower	Lower	Lower	Higher	Lower	Lower	

DISTRICT	YEAR	LD	ID		ED		SLI		OHI		AU		OD	SWD Total	TOTAL ENROLLMENT K12
2008-09															
To DRG AVE.		Higher	Higher		Lower		Lower		Lower		Higher		Lower	Lower	
To State		Lower	Higher		Lower		Lower		Lower		Higher		Lower	Lower	
Analysis	2010-11	Compared to DRG Suffield ranked higher in LD, ID and AU Compared to State Suffield ranked higher in ID and AU Compared to DRG and State Suffield ranked lower in Total SWD													
	2009-10	Compared to DRG Suffield ranked higher in LD, ID and AU Compared to State Suffield ranked higher in LD and AU Compared to DRG and State Suffield ranked lower in Total SWD													
		Suffield's identification rate over the last three years has remained consistent with a slight drop in all disability categories with the exception of OHI, AU and OD													

Appendix G Out-of-district Placements

				2009-10				
By Other	Total	Total # Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Percent Out Placed to Total # SWD	By District	By Other	Total	Total # Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Percent Out Placed to Total # SWD
**		28	0.0%	**	**		27	0.0%
**		41	0.0%	**	**		37	0.0%
**		70	0.0%	**	**		69	0.0%
**		75	0.0%	8	**	8	79	10.1%
**	14	191	7.3%	17	**	17	172	9.9%
**		79	0.0%	6	**	6	64	9.4%
**		23	0.0%	**	**		25	0.0%
**	10	268	3.7%	11	**	11	247	4.5%
**		50	0.0%	**	**		42	0.0%
**		109	0.0%	**	**		113	0.0%
**		152	0.0%	**	**		149	0.0%
**		48	0.0%	**	**		38	0.0%
**		50	0.0%	**	**		48	0.0%
**	14	151	9.3%	10	**	10	142	7.0%
**		77	0.0%	6	**	6	68	8.8%
**		74	0.0%	**	**		65	0.0%
**	15	176	8.5%	14	**	14	167	8.4%
**	8	253	3.2%	19	**	19	256	7.4%
**	16	340	4.7%	20	**	20	337	5.9%
**	11	122	9.0%	10	**	10	125	8.0%
**		124	0.0%	7	**	7	117	6.0%
**	14	233	6.0%	15	**	15	227	6.6%
**	18	281	6.4%	21	**	21	259	8.1%
**	13	155	8.4%	13	**	13	131	9.9%
**	17	265	6.4%	11	**	11	271	4.1%
**	17	214	7.9%	18	**	18	226	8.0%
**	8	258	3.1%	**	**		255	0.0%
**	12	146	8.2%	11	**	11	148	7.4%
**	9	190	4.7%	8	**	8	182	4.4%
		average						7.4%

2011 – Out-of-District Placements

Grade	Disability
PK	Autism
4	Autism
5	Autism
5	OHI-ADD/ADHD
6	Autism
6	ID
7	Autism
8	Autism
9	Autism
9	ED
9	OHI-ADD/ADHD
10	Autism
10	ID
10	OHI-ADD/ADHD
11	ED
11	Mult Dis
12	Autism
12	Autism
12+	Autism
12+	ED
12+	ID
12+	ID

Appendix H District Effort to Improve Language Arts in Students with Disabilities

District efforts to improve language arts per Director of Pupil Services

Specifically in the primary elementary grades Prek-2 the following processes to address acquisition are in place. Students are exposed to letters and sounds of letters in Prek utilizing lively letters. Students at the primary level are given a Dibbles assessment in kindergarten and also looked at in terms of their ability to meet Connecticut standards in terms of phonemic and phonological awareness. Students are then according to their scores afforded the opportunity to be placed in the SAOR program a small group with intensive individual learning to improve these crucial areas needed for literacy (SRBI). Students are then either referred for testing or extended in SOAR depending on testing from the Dibbles. Students after Kindergarten if still struggling often take part in the summer stars program offered by the district and /or are referred.

Identified students have individual goals at the primary level. The programs for each student vary depending on need but might consist of Wilson, Cyberslate and FAD as well as continued access to Lively Letters, and LIPPS strategies from Linda Mood Bell. Reading fluency drills as well as explicit individual instruction in comprehension strategies. This is programming outside of the regular curriculum where identified students with support from either a paraprofessional or a special education teacher take part in guided reading as well as writers workshop. All students utilize leveled literacy. More specifically depending on age the following reading interventions are utilized depending on student need:

- Nancy Boyle's reading strategies
- Visualizing and verbalizing
- Cyberslate
- Wilson
- FAD
- Reading A-Z Fluency
- Cloze passages
- Building Levels of Comprehension
- Reading Milestones
- Teaching Strategies

In terms of writing at this level the program writing without tears is utilized for identified students with Occupational Therapy needs along with a host of visual motor programs to improve the physicality of writing initially. The writer's workshop model is utilized for all students within the classroom and provides support within the classroom as determined for the student. Graphic organizers, Lucy Caulkins six plus one traits, daily language reviews for editing and revising as well as explicit instruction in writing to improve on elaboration and other conventions of writing and story grammar utilizing an interdisciplinary model involving all service providers is utilized for each student.

At the intermediate level for reading all students partake in guided reading with varying levels of in class support depending on need. For identified students individual and small group instruction is offered utilizing the following dependent on the student's specific needs in reading.

- Nancy Boyles answer frames
- Visualizing and verbalizing
- Cyberslate
- Wilson
- FAD
- Reading A-Z Fluency
- Cloze Pro and Cloze passages
- Lexia
- CREC consortium materials
- Stars strategies to build comprehension
- Building Levels of Comprehension

Reading Milestones
Read Naturally
Premier Suite
Teaching Strategies
Clicker 5
Orton-Gillingham
Story Grammar Marker

For writing at the intermediate level all students take part in writer's workshop within the classroom with identified students having varied levels of support depending on need. For identified students the following strategies/interventions are utilized for writing:

Premier Suite
Kidspiration
Graphic organizers
Word banks
Wordly wise
Daily Language review for writing editing/revising
Lucy Caulkins Six Plus one traits
Empowering writers

At the middle school level many of the same interventions are present in the resource room and students depending on the level of need may be supported in the classroom by an adult assist and or placed in co-taught classrooms again depending on the specific needs.

The following strategies are utilized at the middle school level for reading:

Steck Vaughn reading strategies
Cyberslate
Wilson
FAD
Reading A-Z Fluency
Cloze Pro and Cloze passages
Lexia
CREC consortium materials
Stars strategies to build comprehension
Building Levels of Comprehension
Reading Milestones
Read Naturally
Premier Suite
Teaching Strategies
Content specific individual instruction
Clicker 5

The following strategies are utilized for writing at the middle school level:

Premier Suite
Inspiration
Graphic organizers
Word banks
Wordly wise
Daily Language review for writing editing/revising

Appendix I CMT CAPT

2011 CMT RESULTS

Grade 3

	#TESTED	MATH	MATH	#TESTED	READING	READING	#TESTED	WRITING	WRITING
YEAR		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	13	53.8	69.2	11	18.2	36.4	13	15.4	76.9
STATE	2937	32.8	60.1	2542	23.1	37.5	3823	18.0	38.1
2010	16	50.0	87.5	14	35.7	42.9	17	29.9	64.7
2009	15	20.0	40.0	15	13.3	33.3	15	20.0	80.0
2008	24	25.0	41.7	24	25.0	29.2	24	29.2	62.5

Grade 4

	#TESTED	MATH	MATH	#TESTED	READING	READING	#TESTED	WRITING	WRITING
YEAR		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	18	44.4	83.3	17	41.2	47.1	20	50.0	75.0
STATE	3197	35.8	62.4	2718	26.8	40.4	4465	20.6	44.8
2010	16	37.5	56.3	16	12.5	31.3	17	23.5	70.6
2009	22	22.7	27.3	22	13.6	22.7	22	22.7	50.0
2008	26	26.9	57.7	26	11.5	26.9	26	23.1	50.0

Grade 5

	#TESTED	MATH	MATH	#TESTED	READING	READING	#TESTED	WRITING	WRITING
YEAR		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	20	45.0	70.0	18	0	50.0	22	45.5	77.3
STATE	3296	38.1	63.7	2947	23.7	39.3	4688	22.1	52.8
2010	21	28.6	57.1	20	25.0	30.0	20	30.0	55.0
2009	17	47.1	58.8	17	29.4	41.2	18	22.2	77.8
2008	23	8.7	34.8	23	8.7	26.1	23	4.3	52.0

2011 CMT RESULTS

Grade 6

	#TESTED	MATH	MATH	#TESTED	READING	READING	#TESTED	WRITING	WRITING
YEAR		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	21	33.3	71.4	19	47.4	57.9	20	30.0	60.0
STATE	3393	35.8	66.0	3047	40.3	59.0	4835	20.0	47.7
2010	18	50.0	72.2	18	38.9	44.4	19	21.1	57.9
2009	24	25.0	62.5	20	20.0	40.0	24	16.7	58.3
2008	28	28.6	50.0	28	25.0	50.0	28	28.6	53.6

Grade 7

	#TESTED	MATH	MATH	#TESTED	READING	READING	#TESTED	WRITING	WRITING
YEAR		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	20	35.0	70.0	20	40.0	70.0	20	40.0	60.0
STATE	3375	30.4	61.0	3152	42.9	57.1	4741	15.3	36.8
2010	21	42.9	66.7	21	23.8	47.6	23	21.7	52.2
2009	25	32.0	56.0	24	33.3	50.0	26	23.1	46.2
2008	20	20.0	60.0	20	25.0	40.0	20	20.0	50.0

Grade 8

	#TESTED	MATH	MATH	#TESTED	READING	READING	#TESTED	WRITING	WRITING
YEAR		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	19	28.6	81.0	21	28.6	47.6	23	13.0	60.9
STATE	3163	27.8	59.2	3030	38.2	53.1	4430	19.5	39.2
2010	19	38.1	71.4	20	25.0	55.0	22	31.8	40.9
2009	21	21.1	57.9	20	25.0	35.0	20	20.0	30.0
2008	21	26.3	42.1	19	26.3	42.1	19	26.3	57.9

2011 CMT RESULTS

CAPT 2011

	#	Math	Math	#	Read	Read	#	Writing	Writing	#	Sci	Sci
Year		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof		Goal	Prof
2011	20	10.0	55.0	21	9.5	52.4	21	4.8	61.9	20	5.0	65.0
State	31 78	15.9	47.3	32 27	14.1	50.1	406 6	17.3	53.6	41 94	13.1	45.2
2010	14	7.1	50.0	15	6.7	40.0	19	10.5	36.8	18	0	50.0
2009	12	8.3	41.7	12	0.0	50.0	13	7.7	46.2	12	8.3	41.7
2008	20	25.0	70.0	20	25.0	60.0	20	20.0	65.0	20	25.0	75.0