

Student Support Services  
Certified Staff Town Hall Meetings  
Summary of Comments

August 9, 2015

In the spring of 2015, the Office of Student Support Services reorganized its leadership positions to include a Chief Student Support Services Officer and two Executive Director positions that focus on instruction and compliance. The expansion of leadership is part of the larger goal to improve the continuum of services provided to students who receive special education services in the Washoe County School District (WCSD). **An immediate priority of the newly reorganized leadership was to listen to practitioners about their perceptions of the state of special education in the WCSD.** To accomplish this task, seven town hall meetings were held in April and May 2015. Four types of certified practitioner groups were invited to participate, including special education teachers, classroom teachers who are involved with special education, school staff whose work touches special education (e.g. counselors, psychologists), and school administrators, which totaled 662 staff from across the district. Non-certified staff was invited to participate at the Picollo/Turning Point meeting. Participation was remarkable: Over 200 people attended the meetings and provided written and verbal feedback. Additionally, all of the participants were invited to complete an anonymous, open-ended online questionnaire, of which 69 people responded (10% response rate).

The town hall meetings were facilitated using the World Café format. That is, participants gathered in groups to respond to a question on butcher paper and then rotated until all participants had an opportunity to respond to all of the questions. At the end of the last rotation, participants came together in a single group to describe the dominant responses to each question. The discussion questions were 1) what areas do you need support or resources, 2) what barriers prevent the implementation of quality individualized education plans, and 3) what is working well within Student Support Services. A fourth place holder, or “parking lot”, was available for participants to add additional information that did not apply to the three questions. Staff from the Department of Professional Learning organized and facilitated the meetings with support from the Office of Accountability.

A summary of the dominant discussion points from the town hall meetings and anonymous online questionnaire follows. The information gathered from the town hall meetings provides district leadership with information directly from special education practitioners to guide priorities for improvement and raise questions for further investigation<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> A list of comments from the town hall meetings are available upon request. Please contact Jennifer Harris at [jharris@washoeschools.net](mailto:jharris@washoeschools.net) for a list of comments or to submit any questions you have about this summary.

## Prevailing Discussion Topics

### Relationship Between General Education and Special Education

**There was strong consensus about the dedication of school staff to meet students' needs, support inclusionary practices, and expand access to general education classrooms and school activities.** Many participants conveyed their deep appreciation for general education teachers who collaborate well and, in turn, share the responsibility of meeting special education students' needs. However, it was noted that support among general education teachers for special education is not universal. Several participants described a lack of collaboration and "ownership" for all students within their buildings and asked that general education teachers be held accountable for their legal obligations to support Individualized Education Plans (IEP). Others suggested that support among general education staff for special education can be improved by increasing communication about special education goals, providing professional development to all staff about disability types and special education practices, and increasing expectations for all staff to support all students.

**A challenge participants mentioned is lack of time for common planning, communication and collaboration between general and special education staff.** Participants also noted a need for more focused professional development for general education staff and paraprofessionals to better support students with IEPs and to more effectively collaborate with special education staff. Suggested professional development topics included disability types and characteristics, management of behavioral issues, provision of in-classroom support, curriculum accommodations and modifications, instructional delivery to students with special needs, IEP process, and expectations of general education teachers to support IEP goals.

**Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) was described by several participants as inconsistently implemented, particularly at the secondary level.** Some suggested that the eligibility process is not fully understood by general education staff. Additional training for MTSS was requested, particularly pertaining to behavior and interventions for behavior. Several participants requested additional training for school building administrators to become well-versed in MTSS so they can better support the framework.

**Concern was expressed for the ability of special education teachers to provide instruction required to meet students' learning needs** in classes or groupings where there is a wide range of ages and ability levels:

*"Go visit a full 1st through 6th CLS [Comprehensive Life Skills] class and tell me that it is developmentally appropriate for the students, families OR TEACHER. It is AWFUL - especially since the majority of highly impacted students have behaviors as well..."*

Participants acknowledged a need for instruction to improve for students receiving special education. One participant perceived there to be an influx of special education teachers who are not highly qualified (HQ) in English or math who are assigned to resource classes. The

participant stated *“This is harmful to SE students who should be getting better, more individualized/small group instruction. In reality a less than HQ teacher is working with the students who need the most help.”* Several participants believed they could benefit from training in core content areas and how best to incorporate the Nevada Academic Content Standards.

**There was concern that special education teachers are over-burdened with non-instructional duties:** *“Case management is part of the job, but it shouldn't be the main focus. At this time, case management seems to take priority over teaching.”* One participant described the demand of the case management role as severely limiting their ability to provide instruction: *“What I am finding is that the job of being a case manager is far more time consuming than that of being a resource teacher. They are, in fact, both full time jobs.”* Perhaps adding to the case management role, mental health was repeatedly mentioned as a growing area of need and participants recognized that the continuum of services and training to staff must be expanded to meet this challenge. One participant suggested that a solution for providing mental health services to students must be found.

### **Individualized Education Plans**

**Direction for writing IEPs was described as inconsistent between file monitors, implementation specialists (IS), and other leadership members.** One participant provided an example of his/her experience that corresponded to accounts shared by other participants:

*“Files have been monitored multiple times this year and the information received is always different. Our SpEd teachers are learning one thing at defensible IEP trainings and then information is contradicted when files are monitored. One file monitor comes in October and gives directives that are then different than the directives given in December by another file monitor. We even had a SpEd Area Admin. help with the development of an IEP and then a month later, that file was reviewed and found to be not in compliance. Who do you listen to? What directives do you follow?”*

The same person continued to describe the effects of inconsistent directives, suggesting that it contributes to low morale and a lack of confidence in the Student Support Services leaders:

*“There is a punitive feeling to special education when file monitors come to school sites demanding that IEP's be revised because, “If you don't, we will lose funding”... When a sped teacher is told to revise an IEP, the directive is coming from people who don't seem to understand the amount of time and energy it takes to revise an IEP (parent contact, prior notice, time to revise the document, scheduling the meeting...)”*

**There is a perception that sometimes there are not systemic resources to implement and test a full variety of accommodations in specific IEPs.** Several participants expressed concern that potential accommodations may not be implemented in an IEP because the school does not

have resources to fully enact them. One participant described the influence of staff insecurity to written accommodations at their school this way: *The case managers are hesitant to write in specially designed instruction, co-teaching support, or behavior modification programs when there is not the guarantee of staff to provide the services.*” Described as “demoralizing,” this practice contributes to the sense that staff members are not always doing what is best for students.

**Participants requested district leadership to recognize that compliance to IEPs is a systems issue, rather than placing blame on teachers for non-compliance.** One participant asked the question:

*“When the people who are supposed to be supporting me as a resource teacher are unavailable to answer questions, get my students what they need, or give me the updated information on paperwork then how am I supposed to be expected to do everything as perfectly as it needs to be done?”*

**Other barriers to effective IEP implementation included inconsistent and infrequent progress monitoring and lack of time to dedicate toward thoughtfully writing the IEP.** Time devoted to compliance issues and processes was described as a distraction from providing quality support to students. Several participants described needing more time to be creative and to think deeply about how to best support students. Additionally, the challenges to implementing quality IEPs affect many other areas of work for special education staff. Participants stated that these challenges negatively impact their time management, morale, confidence in district leadership to provide accurate information, ability to adequately meet student needs, and transition of students.

## **Transition**

Transition occurs when students experience a change in status or programming, including movement from one school to another, from educational levels, and from program type to another. **Several participants commented that transition practices need to be improved to better support special education students’ movement from elementary school to middle school and from middle school to high school.** Some did not know if written procedures are in place for transition from one level to the next. It was suggested that the “when,” “who,” and “how” for the transition process is not well known or consistently practiced across schools. Concern was also expressed about a lack of continuity of special education services across elementary, middle, and high schools. One participant described the challenge of supporting IEP goals across schools:

*“You can have an IEP at one school that is totally different when at a new school, no fluidity, they would mention one program and we wouldn’t have it when that student came by, our school had Aimsweb with goal around Aimsweb, but if other schools don’t have it, we have to develop a new goal to replace that one.”*

Transition challenges are related to the IEP process and inconsistent messages and practices across schools regarding special education. Participants asked for more consistency in these areas across schools suggesting consistency could be fostered by improving leadership and support for staff in schools.

### **Organizational Support for Staff**

**Strong leadership is important at the district and school levels.** Participants were appreciative of school administrators who had backgrounds in special education and felt their backgrounds allowed them to be stronger leaders for all students in the school building. One participant described their administrator this way: *“We have a wonderful administrator knowledgeable in behavior management and sped laws! I feel supported and appreciated at my school site.”* Supportive school administrators were also described by participants as being (a) protective of staff time for Intervention Assistance Team participation and collaboration with general education teachers, (b) willing to release special education staff to participate in professional development and other out-of-school special education related functions (e.g. town hall meetings, conferences, training events), and (c) committed to upholding inclusionary practices.

**Participants would like administrators and district leadership to educate the public about offered programs and to couch reasonable expectations.** Although parents and guardians were valued by participants, some felt that parents often do not understand the special education process and can complicate the delivery of services to students. Others requested that district leadership advocate for special education in the district. One participant requested that district leadership *“Continue to listen to us and lobby for hard changes.”* Many expressed a sense of hopefulness regarding the reorganization of special education in the WCSD, but cautioned that they need to see positive changes before heralding the reorganization as a success.

**Inconsistent direction and expectations from district leadership and support staff was described as a significant barrier to effectively performing job functions.** Although several district individuals were identified as effective communicators, a resounding complaint was there is not an effective process of information dissemination regarding special education. Many participants described instances of having received different answers to the same question from district-level staff: *“We get different answers to big questions from different people, the right never knows what the left is doing.”* The importance of consistent messaging was expressed by one participant this way: *“Mixed messages need to be eliminated as to prevent ongoing violations and difficulties involving related services, specially designed instruction, [and] accommodations/modifications.”* Additionally, several participants noted how school-based personnel do not have confidence in district leadership with respect to their knowledge of special education practices, protocols, and compliance.

**Although many participants appreciated the support provided by ISs, many commented that the IS program needs improvement.** Participants would like for ISs to have strong backgrounds in special education, to respond to questions in a timely manner, and to be physically present more often at their school sites. Several participants asked for ISs to spend

more time at their assigned schools in order to become more knowledgeable about school specific issues. One person mentioned they would like to have an avenue to provide feedback regarding how the IS program is serving their school. Several participants suggested replacing the IS model altogether with site-based facilitators because they would be able to develop deep knowledge of the schools they serve and have relationships with students, parents, teachers, and administrators. This valuable knowledge was thought to better position site facilitators to review IEPs, proactively, before execution, to ensure they meet compliance, and to monitor timelines. Although there are challenges within the current IS model, many participants recognized the positive role the IS has within their schools' work: *"When the IS for our site is able to come for a monthly training, it is a helpful and productive time with our team."*

**The importance of quality support staff, such as instructional aides, to meeting the needs of students and providing administrative supports was emphasized:** *"Without our support staff we are often unable to teach important content."* Several instances of schools losing highly desired staff, as a result of organizational shifts and low pay, were recounted. Participants demanded additional pay for support staff to incentivize these positions and requested that aides have stability in their placements and *"not be switched around."* A need for substitutes for teachers, aides and other staff was also expressed. Substitutes are needed for short and long-term absences, for staff to attend training events, and allow time for staff to complete necessary job functions outside of the classroom (e.g. paperwork, IEP meetings). Finally, access to translators was described as limited and participants asked for increased availability of translators to assist in IEP meetings and in communicating with families.

**Participants asked for leaders and other support staff, including coordinators, ISs, and paraprofessionals, to have experience and training in special education, specifically.** Many participants noted that knowledge of special education should be an essential requirement for anyone who enters the field. To further ensure staff has a necessary level of knowledge about special education, participants suggested that all new hires be provided intensive training in special education prior to starting their position.

### **Time and Compensation**

**There was consensus among participants that caseload versus workload needs to be examined and addressed by district leadership.** Workload is dictated by the severity of needs and intensity of supports, and caseload is the number of students with disabilities in a school. Together, workload and caseload determine the amount of time required to appropriately serve students. Participants explained that workload and caseload are often unevenly distributed across schools and among staff, resulting in an inability to provide quality support to all students. One participant described the issue: *"Allocations should be based on student need/severity instead of just numbers. A full class of 12 in a first through 6th CLS is NOT THE SAME as 12 students with a learning disability!"* Several participants requested that workload and caseload be considered within the formula for allocations to more fairly distribute positions across schools.

**Many participants said the time they have in the day is insufficient to effectively perform their duties:** *“Special Ed teachers seldom have enough time to properly manage their cases let alone adequately support the students.”* Demands on staff time mentioned included data collection/documentation of accommodations, paperwork, unexpected requests from Student Support Services without lead time to respond, revision of IEPs, unnecessary meetings, meetings to fight for allocations, responding to email, responding to behavior needs, certain approaches to progress monitoring (i.e. AimsWeb probes), testing, writing student learning objectives (referred to as SLOs), lack of timely responses from district support (requires time to search for answers on own), progress reports, and providing information to Student Support Services Records Department each time a file changes school sites.

**Participants asked for compensation for the time they dedicate to performing work duties outside of contract hours.** Many described the numerous hours they dedicate to their work outside of contract hours, often at great sacrifice to their personal lives. Fair compensation was mentioned as a necessary component of support for teachers; however, it is only one element of support that will aid in teachers’ ability to do their jobs well. One person noted: *“A consistent, significant pay bonus for SpEd would at least help with recognition and be some incentive but realistically, money doesn't buy more time in the day.”*

### **Professional Development for Special Education Staff**

**Overall, participants appreciated the professional development opportunities offered to them and wanted more.** One participant’s comment provides an example of the other comments made:

*“The CLS trainings that have been coming fast and furious this year as well as attending the HOT TOPICS classes, has really helped with consistency with how to write and what to include in the IEP's. I have a great team I work with and they answer any of my questions quickly or find someone who knows the answer(s) for me.”*

Additional access to instruction on specific special education topics is welcomed. Participants asked for targeted, individualized professional development to meet learning needs of specific, special education roles. There were many professional development topics referenced as being valuable to their work. Participants expressed an interest in having more frequent and in-depth training opportunities that focus on the following:

- Defensible IEP writing
- Easy IEP
- Co-teaching model
- Strategies of intervention for classroom teachers
- How to plan and use time wisely
- Strategies for monitoring files
- HOT TOPICS
- CLS trainings
- Collaborative writing of IEPs
- Writing measurable goals



- Avoiding pitfalls, conflicts, and litigation
- How to work with various disabilities
- How to incorporate the Nevada Academic Content Standards into IEP and instruction
- Writing behavioral plans
- Recognizing and responding to mental health issues
- Direct instruction resources for students with severe reading and math disabilities
- Working with students on the autism spectrum
- Inclusion model, in-class support, and the co-teaching model of instruction and how they should operate
- Eligibility determination
- Distinguishing between typical struggling students and students eligible for specialized instruction
- Conducting Functional Behavioral Assessments
- Instructional interventions and strategies
- Managing classroom behavior
- Characteristics of disability types
- Special education law

**Several suggestions were provided to improve the professional development offered to special education practitioners.** Participants asked for professional development to be delivered by district staff who are leaders in the special education field. Training delivered by WCSD staff will celebrate the talent of WCSD staff and information will likely be more well-received by others who seek first-hand knowledge of WCSD programs. Participants requested there be more examples of exemplary practices and properly completed documents so that special education staff can learn from those examples. Some participants appreciated opportunities to participate in nationally organized conferences. Finally, several participants requested training at the beginning of the school year to better equip staff to respond to expectations for the upcoming year. Some suggested that utilizing district training days to provide targeted professional development to special education staff would be an efficient way to deliver special education-specific content.

**Although there is a mentor program in place for new teachers, several participants asked for greater support for new teachers.** The first year of teaching was described as confusing and isolated and several participants requested increased support for new teachers. One participant appreciated their mentor, but recounted that access was limited and suggested implementing an on-site mentor program to improve access. Additionally, participants requested that teachers with deep understanding of special education and of school issues serve as mentors.

### **Special Education Staff Morale**

Participants repeatedly described their concern for low morale among special education teachers and staff:

*“I have never seen morale so low. Teachers feel disrespected and deprofessionalized. They do not have the materials they need to do their jobs. They do not have adequate*



*support staff or, in some cases, [have] support staff that is incompetent. They have no prep or lunch and work many hours at home. They are expected to stay after school for long hours and are not compensated.”*

Participants noted several factors that influence morale:

*“The expectations on special education teachers in our district seem to be increasing at an exponential rate as allocations decrease and the IEP process becomes more confusing and cumbersome.”*

*“I have done this job for many years and my heart breaks when my students do not get what they need because I am so overstretched that I cannot provide it for them.”*

Participants described increasing number of expectations, lack of time to do their jobs appropriately, changing established expectations, and general sense of low respect for special education within the WCSD as sources of frustration. Another participant described the problem of low morale by starting with a poignant question:

*“You realize that in order to “burn out” you were once on fire? Stress, deadlines, lack of direction and time, unrealistic expectations, scheduling meetings, filling out lengthy and not helpful progress reports, and many more things are quenching the fires of educators who really just want to teach.”*

It is clear from participant discussions that low morale and “burn out” are significant challenges to WCSD special education. Despite these challenges, special education staff determinedly continue serving the students they care about. In describing why they persist within their positions, participants said that recalling the passion they have for their students drives them to continue their work and advocate for positive change in WCSD.

## **Celebrations**

**Overwhelmingly, participants were extremely positive when talking about their students and the families they serve.** One participant stated, *“Students and families make the job worth it.”* Other participants explained, *“We have great rapport with families”* and noted *“strong teacher-student relationships”* as highlights of their work. Participants were passionate about students and many described how they are inspired by their students to do their best each day. Other positive reactions included:

- Use of team-based practices that encompass the whole student based on student needs
- Strong inclusion practices at some schools attributed to the openness and dedication of general education and special education teachers working in partnership to strengthen learning for students

- Positive working relationships with co-teachers, general education teachers, parents, and administrators

### **Unique Educational Settings**

Several programs are substantially different from other schools sites and require separate consideration, including Picollo and Turning Point, Incline High School, and Early Childhood Development. Additional topics relevant to each of these sites are briefly summarized are briefly described; however, additional attention from district leadership needs to be given to these schools in order to fully uncover the unique strengths and constraints each negotiates.

#### **Picollo and Turning Point**

All students at Picollo and Turning Point have IEPs, which requires all staff to have deep knowledge of special education practices, disability types and needs, and strategies for delivering instruction and services to students with a wide range of abilities. Teacher and staff retention was mentioned as critical to providing high quality support by retaining institutional knowledge and maintaining long-term relationships with students and staff. Additionally, universal appreciation for non-certified support staff was expressed. Participants viewed non-certified staff as crucial to providing quality student support and thus advocated for better support staff compensation to reduce turnover and encourage strong applicants. Other areas of immediate concern noted by Picollo and Turning Point participants included:

- Technical infrastructure required for reporting and assistive technology is limited
- Need for highly specialized, targeted training and professional development
- Need for more qualified staff to support students with severe behavior challenges

#### **Incline High School**

Incline High School (IHS) is a small school, relative to other WCSD high schools, and is geographically isolated, and thus faces unique service delivery challenges. As a small school, IHS participants cited how having to wear multiple hats has both advantages and disadvantages. Staff members work closely together to support inclusionary practices. Yet taking on multiple roles can lead to an imbalance of time available to accomplish all tasks.

Geographic isolation is a challenge to IHS service delivery. Participants explained that the school's distance from Reno limits the number of site visits it receives from district personnel and support staff, reduces opportunities for professional development, and curtails collaboration with non-IHS special education staff. Furthermore, its location makes recruiting highly qualified special education staff problematic.

Caseload versus workload was described as a critical issue at IHS. Although teachers may serve fewer students, as compared to other schools' caseloads, often there is a wider range of student needs within classrooms. Furthermore, the spectrum of student need and the number of students who require support services changes yearly. According to participants the variability in student need contributes to instability of allocations from year to year.

Requests made by IHS participants included:

- Increased number of allocations to meet the range of student needs represented at IHS. Also, the number and assignment of allocations need to be stable from year to year to limit disruption to staffing, maintain consistent support to students, and to preserve relationships between staff with students and families.
- Increased site visits from district staff to participate in student support service delivery. Participants welcome visits by district leadership to best understand the challenges and strengths at IHS.

#### Early Childhood, Pre-K and Multi Age Services

Special education services for young students, ages 9 and younger, is a complex system that requires separate consideration. Although staff members who serve young students participated in the town hall meetings, their responses were mostly indistinguishable from other participants. Despite this limitation, several comments about early childhood services were identified. Positive comments noted the value of the monthly department meetings to help with information dissemination and collaboration with other early childhood personnel and success in collaborating with outside agencies. Participants also commented on the value of early childhood education to vulnerable student populations: *“Children who are victims of trauma (foster, abuse, attachment, SEL issues) get services with ECSE! We serve a significant portion of this demographic. We make a difference.”*

Several concerns also emerged. One person suggested that changes to the program during the previous school year harmed the program: *“The shuffling of programs/overages of teachers in EC Pre-K/Multiage has had a HUGE negative impact on the program as a whole.”* Another participant questioned the appropriateness of the Nevada Administrative Code that limits the use of the developmentally delayed (DD) eligibility category to age 6; whereas federal guidelines within the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) allow for the DD category to be used until age 9. Another participant described the need for full-day developmental kindergarten and framed the argument as an equity issue:

*“It is unfair to not offer a full day program to these students if typical peers are having access to it. This could be considered discrimination and many parents have noted this. The district must come up with a full day DK program for these students or there is bound to be a due process lawsuit and the parent would win according to IDEA.”*

Outside the scope of the town hall meeting, services provided to young students ought to be examined to more fully uncover the challenges of service delivery within this age group.

## Conclusion

### Valuing Input

**The special education staff's dedication and commitment to their work in supporting students was a prominent theme across all discussion groups.** This strength can be a valuable resource for district leadership when developing improvement plans. Participants want to contribute to strengthening Student Support Services and appreciated the opportunity to provide honest feedback. One participant expressed the sentiment this way:

*"I love this district, my coworkers and my students. I often get emotional when talking about my students and feel very impassioned about the change that needs to occur in our district. I have many thoughts and ideas as do the experienced SPED staff at my school. I welcome any of you to come and sit with us and we will share all of our wonderful ideas with you. Thank you!"*

Many participants would like ongoing opportunities to contribute in meaningful ways towards continuous improvement of Student Support Services; however, some expressed concern that the desire for their feedback may not be genuine. One participant wrote, *"If you are truly listening, thank you."* It is extremely important that requests for input are genuine and valued - not just an exercise for appearances.

### Suggestions for Improvement

Participants described many complex and often interrelated challenges to the delivery of student support services. Two common threads of concern ran through all discussion groups and topics: (a) insufficient time to adequately perform all position responsibilities and (b) inconsistency of support, communication, and practices across schools. Although challenges were described as requiring immediate attention, participants noted that they are not insurmountable and provided several actionable solutions for consideration. Four predominant suggestions to improve delivery of services within Student Support Services included:

- 1. Improve communication between district-level staff and school-based personnel.** Provide timely and accurate responses to requests for support, and offer immediate access to information and resources.
- 2. Provide recognition of and support for special education teachers.** Consider the dual roles of special education positions (instructional and case management), when evaluating teacher performance. One person suggested that special education staff need to be evaluated within a system that accounts for the unique demands and expectations of staff within special education.
- 3. Conduct an audit to determine severity of student needs and number of students who require services per school.** Use this information to determine allocation distribution across WCSD schools.

4. **Directly observe and participate in special education delivery at school sites.** A repeated request made by participants was for district leadership and ISs to become familiar with the unique strengths and challenges of each school through increased site visits and classroom observations.

Additional suggestions offered by participants included:

- Provide greater access to translators for IEP meetings
- Provide meaningful examples of goal writing at the high school level
- Hire experienced teachers as mentors for new teachers and hire more mentors
- Provide substitutes for aides and other support staff
- Provide assistance with paperwork and scheduling
- Provide more access to assistive technologies
- Provide different classrooms for Strategies and CLS students in circumstances where they are currently sharing classroom space
- Provide more support for self-contained classrooms
- Provide longer and consecutive preparation time (as opposed small chunks of dispersed prep time throughout the day)
- Remove requirement for SLOs because they seem redundant to IEP
- Human resource program “Changing Lanes” program is beneficial
- Ensure school will not face reductions in allocations each year
- Consolidate some services with general education to combine resources, money, time, and effort where appropriate

### **Questions Raised for Further Investigation**

Information gathered from participants raised additional questions. Questions posed by participants included:

- Are resources and practices equitably distributed across schools?
- Is the utilization of current special education personnel effective in serving students who need special education services?
- Does staffing and resource distribution reflect actual student needs?
- What areas within the school building can general education and special education be better coordinated or merged?
- How does policy and accountability limit or enhance student ability to graduate with a standard diploma?