



**Wyoming
Annual Performance Report
For Special Education
FFY 2006**

**Special Programs Unit
320 West Main Street
Riverton, WY 82501
www.k12.wy.us**

February 1, 2008

**Wyoming Department of Education
Dr. Jim McBride, Superintendent of Public Instruction**

**Wyoming
Annual Performance Report for Special Education
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)**

**Submitted to the
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
February 1, 2008**

**Special Programs Unit
320 West Main Street
Riverton, WY 82501
www.k12.wy.us**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	1
Indicator 1: High School Graduation Rate	4
Indicator 2: High School Dropout Rate	9
Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment.....	14
Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion.....	24
Indicator 5: Placement of Students, Ages 6-21.....	29
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement	33
Indicator 9: Disproportionality, Special Education and Related Services.....	40
Indicator 10: Disproportionality, Specific Disability Categories	46
Indicator 11: 60-Day Timeline for Evaluations	51
Indicator 12: Transition from Part C to Part B.....	55
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	58
Indicator 15: General Supervision.....	62
Indicator 16: Formal Complaints	68
Indicator 17: Due Process.....	70
Indicator 18: Resolution Sessions	72
Indicator 19: Mediations	74
Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data.....	76
Attachments.....	81

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development**Wyoming's Broad Stakeholder Input**

The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE), Special Programs Unit staff, and the Early Intervention and Education Program (EIEP) staff of the Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD) in the Wyoming Department of Health, collected and analyzed data for the development of the Annual Performance Report for FFY 2006 and for the new indicators in the State Performance Plan. Broad stakeholder involvement continued from the initial development of the State Performance Plan (see Overview of the State Performance Plan Development, Wyoming's Broad Stakeholder Input, page 1). This particular Stakeholder Group was invited to serve as the guiding group for the WDE's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring Process established in FFY 2005. This same group, because of its broad stakeholder representation, has continued to serve as the Stakeholder Group for the SPP/APR. Local special education directors, teachers and parents; members of the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities; members of the Wyoming Transition Council; members of the Wyoming Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC); representatives from the Parent Information Center (PIC); persons with disabilities; and building principals and district superintendents serve as members of this stakeholder group. Each of the twenty indicators, both new and current, with data for the 2006-2007 school year, was reviewed with this group during December of 2007 and January of 2008. This group carefully considered the data for each indicator, reasons for progress or slippage for each indicator, and provided input for establishing targets for new indicators and additional improvement activities by indicator as needed.

The Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (State Advisory Panel operating in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.167 through 300.169) reviewed the SPP/APR indicators and data throughout the FFY 2006. Parents of children with disabilities make up the majority of the membership of this panel which brings a very valuable perspective to the analysis of the data and subsequent improvement activities. The document was presented and then reviewed at the January 2008 meeting of the panel in its final draft for additional input prior to submission to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

The EIEP worked with additional stakeholders specifically around indicators six through eight, and twelve, as well as the indicators pertinent to monitoring and accountability required for the three- to five-year -old population. This stakeholder group included members of the State Early Intervention Council (EIC), the Child Development Center (CDC) directors and family members from each of the fourteen regions. The EIC membership includes parents who have young children with special needs, directors from the CDCs, service providers from the CDCs, state legislators, staff from higher education, PIC, consultants, representatives from both the Wyoming Department of Education and the Wyoming Department of Health, preschool providers, and other key community representatives.

Ensuring Data Accuracy

The Special Programs Unit works in concert with the Careers/Technology/Data and Standards/Assessment/Accountability Units of the WDE in the collection of data regarding students with disabilities ages three through the school year in which they turn twenty-one and the ensuing verification of data accuracy. With the implementation of a unique student identification system (Wyoming Integrated Statewide Education Data System – WISE), the WDE has the capability to cross validate the various data collections that come into the state from the local school districts. As a result, we have evidence that the data submitted by the school districts continue to become more accurate with each subsequent collection. The collections of FFY 2006 were significantly improved in process and error rates decreased significantly compared to the collections of FFY 2005.

The Wyoming Department of Education continues its concerted effort to ensure valid and accurate data collection from the local school districts and other public agencies. These efforts include the work of the WDE Data Quality Council which includes members from every unit of the WDE. This council meets on a regular basis to discuss necessary improvements to current data collections. The council works to provide technical assistance and guidance to district staff involved in data submission at the local level by

means of coordinated trainings and the provision of a “Data Dictionary” which clarifies specific data terms, requirements and expectations for each separate data collection.

Wyoming State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report Dissemination to the Public

The State Performance Plan was originally placed on the WDE website in December of 2005. It has continued to be the driving force for all of the major projects, initiatives, and monitoring efforts of the Special Programs Unit for the past two years. After revisions are made to the SPP, it will again be placed on the WDE website for public review. The Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006 will accompany the revised SPP and the FFY 2005 APR on the WDE website www.k12.wy.us/se.asp. Both documents will be sent to each school district and the EIEP through the on-line process used to provide superintendents and special education directors with memoranda and information from the WDE (Superintendents’ Memos). Each member of the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities will receive a copy of the SPP and APR documents at their quarterly meeting (January 30, 2008). The parent advocacy groups and Protection and Advocacy, Inc. will be sent information about where the documents can be accessed. WDE will work with PIC to send pertinent information to parents of students with disabilities across the state. The WDE Special Programs Unit includes, and will continue to include, a review of the indicators in the SPP when conducting training regarding IDEA 04 and the revised (July 17, 2007) Wyoming Education Rules, Chapter 7: Governing Services for Children with Disabilities. Presentations at various venues such as the School Improvement Conference and Leadership Symposium will include the data for the APR and the justification for progress or slippage related to the targets established in the SPP. Improvement activities and their affect on improving outcomes for students with disabilities will continue to be reviewed and revised as needed through a data-based, decision-making process.

Annual Report to the Public Regarding the Measurable and Rigorous Targets

In accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(C)(ii) the WDE reports annually to the public on the performance of each local educational agency and intermediate education unit on the targets in the State Performance Plan. The WDE Special Programs Unit reports annually to the general public, using the Annual Performance Report and individual school district “Report Cards” as a vehicle to report progress toward the targets established in the SPP. An example of the District Report Card is included in the SPP as Attachment 7. The districts not only determine whether they met the targets, but also compare their rates to the State rates and to the actual targets. The District Report Cards, data from the self-assessment component of the monitoring system, and results of on-site monitoring visits were used to make *determinations* for each of the local school districts as outlined in proposed Chapter 7 Rules Part 8, Section 8: WDE Determinations. (See Indicator #15 in the SPP and the APR for more detail). The annual reports will be reviewed by the WDE and the EIEP as part of the Continuing Improvement and data-based Focused Monitoring Process to determine the need for technical assistance and professional development in the process of correcting non-compliance. These efforts will all be conducted for the purpose of ensuring positive functional and academic outcomes for children with disabilities ages three through twenty-one in the State of Wyoming.

General Supervision: Connections Between Compliance with Program Requirements and Student Outcomes/Results

In order to meet its goal of ensuring positive functional and academic outcomes for all Wyoming’s children with disabilities, the WDE has designed and implemented a multi-faceted general supervision system. The monitoring component of this system contains four components: 1) Stable Self-Assessment, 2) Risk-Based Self-Assessment. 3) On-Site Focused Monitoring and 4) On-Site Random Monitoring. Student-level educational results and data guide the activities conducted in each of the four components listed above, ensuring that compliance with requirements related to student outcomes are monitored in a thorough, substantive manner.

In addition, compliance with program requirements which are not as closely related to student outcomes is also addressed through these four components of the state’s monitoring system. The table below sets

forth the relation among the four components, the SPP indicators, program requirements related to the indicators, and other program requirements not directly related to the SPP Indicators.

Monitoring System Component	SPP Indicator	Compliance with Program Requirements Related to SPP Indicators	Compliance with Program Requirements not Directly Related to SPP Indicators
Stable Self-Assessment (All Districts Complete)	4	ascertain data accuracy	districts self-monitor compliance with select requirements through a comprehensive file review checklist
	5c	justify restrictive placements	
	13	apply NSTTAC checklist	
	20	ascertain data accuracy	
Risk-Based Self-Assessment (Districts Complete Based on Data)	3a	districts specify steps to meet AYP targets	Not Applicable
	3b	districts with less than 95% participation explain why	
	9	districts set forth policies and procedures for review	
	10		
	11	districts explain each reason for missing the timeline requirement for each student affected	
On-Site Focused Monitoring (Districts Selected Based on Data via Results of the Weighted Formula)	1	compliance with requirements related to these indicators monitored on-site by WDE in every district selected	WDE applies a comprehensive file review checklist to a sample of student files
	2		
	3c		
	5a		
	5b	on-site review in districts at "Significant" level	
	9		
	10		
13	WDE applies NSTTAC checklist		
On-Site Random Monitoring (Random Selection)	same as on-site focused monitoring		

Selection of Districts for On-Site Focused Monitoring

In order to facilitate the selection of districts for on-site monitoring visits, all of Wyoming's 48 school districts were divided into three population groups. The WDE, with the assistance of the Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Group, created a weighted formula which was used to rank districts according to their performance on a select group of SPP Indicators. For the districts monitored during FFY 2006, the table below shows the Indicators used in the WDE's weighted formula and the weight given to each.

SPP Indicator for District Selection	Weight
1	18.75%
2	18.75%
3c	18.75%
3c	18.75%
5a	12.5%
5b	12.5%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	48.5% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

School Year	Overall Graduation Rates *	Number of Overall Graduates *	Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities	Number of Graduating Students with Disabilities
2006-2007	79.1%	5409	52.1%	474

**Overall graduation data includes both students with and without disabilities.*

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The State met this target and the gap between the overall graduation rate and the graduation for students with disabilities narrowed by almost four percent. Activities outlined in the SPP for Indicator #1 carried out during FFY2006 contributed to the increase in the graduation rate for students with disabilities. Graduation requirements for students in Wyoming are quite rigorous as set forth in statute (W.S. § 21-2-304) and rule (*Chapter 31: Graduation Requirements*). This carries significant importance within the WDE's overall strategic plan which in turn aligns with the Governor's goal for education.

A full description of the graduation requirements is outlined in the *Overview of Issue* for Indicator #1 in the SPP and may also be reviewed online at <http://soswy.state.wy.us/RULES/5218.pdf>. All students are required to meet the same graduation requirements, and accommodations for students with disabilities are provided in accordance with their IEPs or Section 504 Accommodation Plans.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Recruit and retain highly qualified special education staff to work with diverse student populations.*

The WDE Special Programs Staff continued to work closely with staff at the University of Wyoming through activities outlined in the State Personnel Development Grant specific to pre-service training of special education teachers. WDE supports a percentage of a Special Education professor's salary who works in tandem with the RTI and PBIS Statewide Initiatives. University of Wyoming undergraduates in education are provided with coursework related to the use of scientifically based interventions in the regular classroom as well as instruction in the use of positive behavior interventions and supports. As these students are placed for practicum and student-teaching experiences, careful consideration is given to placing them with school districts that have or are in the process of implementing RTI and PBIS.

Data indicate that since the legislature increased the school funding model in 2006-2007 to substantially increase teacher salaries across the State, more of these UW graduates are staying in Wyoming to teach. Additionally, school districts are encouraged through the Consolidated Grant Process to use federal funds (i.e., Title II, IDEA Part B 611, etc.) to provide incentives such as signing bonuses to help recruit teachers. Federal funds are also being used to provide staff with retention bonuses. These strategies appear to have positive results for recruiting and retaining special educators. WDE staff and legislators continue to be concerned about the anticipated loss of teachers across the State to retirement over the next three years. Recruitment and retention efforts will continue to be on the forefront of improvement activities. Staffing levels are evaluated annually through the various data collections including, WDE 602 Staffing Report, WDE 401 Special Education Reimbursement Request, and the End-of-Project Report from the Consolidated Grant (Part B 611 funds).

The WDE staff work closely with districts in the process of recruiting highly qualified special education staff, including related service providers. Incentives are provided to districts that choose to collaborate in their efforts to recruit and share contracted time (especially in the smaller, more isolated districts) for hard-to-find related services providers (e.g., speech language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists). Those incentives include funding to attend national conferences (e.g., LRP Special Education Law Conference, CEC National Conference) and recognition at state conferences.

WDE will be working with the Professional Teaching Standards Board to develop a data base "clearing house" of job openings by district to determine where the SEA might be more involved in helping districts recruit special education staff. This piece of Activity #1 is only in the planning stages currently. The WDE is reviewing the process used by the Kansas Department of Education.

Activity 2: *Provide professional development opportunities designed to enhance skills of personnel working with diverse student populations.*

The WDE Special Programs Unit sponsored a variety of professional development activities during the 2006-2007 school year. Those activities included:

The 6th Annual Teton Institute held in July in Jackson Hole, WY. Some 578 educators from across Wyoming and surrounding states (and as far away as the Samoan Islands) attended this training opportunity sponsored in partnership with Sopris West of Cambium Learning. Sessions focused upon the implementation of the RTI process aimed at improving student outcomes; research-based instructional strategies in math and reading; implementation of research-based practices for PBIS; leadership skills in the change process and implementation steps.

WDE sponsored a team of district transition specialists to the National Dropout prevention conference in Charlotte, SC. These educators are involved in the efforts with the WDE to improve transition planning and strategies for students with disabilities who are 16 and older in order to influence positive post school outcomes.

Based upon data regarding post school outcomes for low incidence populations (specifically Deaf/Hard of Hearing and Visually Impaired) the WDE placed a strong emphasis on transition and effective instructional strategies for teachers and service providers of these students. These programs included: 1) The Wyoming Deaf-Blind Project which provided trainings to address needs of students with visual impairments, hearing impairments, deafness, blindness and multiple disabilities; 2) Communication Matrix Assessment – how to determine current levels of communication ability and set future communication goals; 3) Every Move Counts: Sensory-Based Strategies for Identifying Appropriate Technological Interventions for Individuals with Severe and Profound Differences; 4) Emergent to Transitional to Conventional Literacy: Moving Through the Beginning Literacy Framework – supporting literacy development for upper elementary, middle and secondary students with severe disabilities, and 5) Emergent Literacy for Students: A Project Based Approach – addressing literacy needs for older students through the application of project based learning.

In partnership with NCA and the University of Wyoming holds a fall and spring School Improvement Conference. Nearly 1000 Wyoming educators attend the conference during both the fall and spring session. This conference covers a variety of topics including scientifically, research-based instructional strategies for language arts and math; leadership in the change process; RTI and PBIS implementation strategies; and assessment and accountability to name a few.

Activity 3: *Implement Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) in education agencies across the state.*

The WDE began work this past year with the fourth cohort of schools involved in the implementation of schoolwide PBIS. WDE continues a contract with Dr. Jeff Sprague and receive guidance from the MPRRC and the PBIS Center at the University of Oregon. The emphasis with the schools in first three cohorts was on building the capacity in their districts/schools to sustain the efforts of the PBIS teams, train coaches, and use data to make needed strategy changes. All of these schools are reporting data through SWIS which allows the State to review data and progress in these schools. Achievement data is also carefully reviewed for the districts in their third year of implementation to draw correlations between the PBIS and positive trends in achievement for all students, but particularly students with disabilities. Data are showing positive trends in these schools. These data are shared with educators and administrators from across the State through presentations at the annual spring School Improvement Conference and the Leadership Symposium.

PBIS was a major focus of the 6th Annual Teton Institute held in Jackson Hole in partnership with Cambium Learning's Sopris West. This continues to be a very positive professional development opportunity attended by over 500 educators from WY, surrounding states, and as far away as the Samoan Islands.

Through the PBIS Initiative, districts are receiving technical assistance in addressing students who are at an increased risk of dropping out as a result of behavioral issues. The 38 schools in the PBIS initiative receive training on behavioral interventions, on-site technical support, and assistance in data collection and analysis in order to identify targeted at-risk populations. One major component of the PBIS process is the systems approach of developing and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. As the PBIS initiative continues, the State will be able to demonstrate how the decrease in severe behavioral incidences impacts the outcome indicators for the State.

Activity 4: *Identify and provide other targeted assistance in line with identified needs of districts around meeting AYP*

Graduation rate data by district was used as a component of the 2006-2007 Focused Monitoring Process conducted by the WDE. Tying these data to compliance in the areas of IEP provisions/requirements in Part B of the IDEA 34 CFR §§300.320 through 300.324, FAPE (§300.101) and Highly Qualified Personnel (§300.156 (a) and (b)) became a focus of on-site monitoring. Districts with poor outcome data for students with disabilities were targeted for

monitoring and technical assistance in providing research-based interventions for students with disabilities through the IEP and transition planning process. The monitoring process connecting compliance to outcomes is explained in detail in the discussion section of Indicator #15.

Activity 5: *Coordinate with the Wyoming Transition Council to identify systemic graduation and dropout issues for students with disabilities including a focus on effective transition plans.*

Members of the WTC were instrumental in developing a model state Transition IEP form that would act as a guide to districts in developing compliant and effective transition plans for youth with disabilities. The activities of this Council are further detailed in Indicator #13.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE continues to analyze data and adjust improvement activities and timelines accordingly. As WDE has examined graduation data concerning youth with disabilities for the past two years and worked with districts to improve transition planning for these students, additions have been made to the Improvement Activities, reflecting necessary changes. Additional resources and activities have been added to the State Performance Plan for Indicator #1. Cross Collaborative Teams (CCT) have been established across the WDE for the purpose of examining technical assistance and improvement activities regarding graduation rates. It is a critical component of the WDE Strategic Plan and that of the State Board of Education and ties into the Governor's Wyoming Education Quality of Life Result/Goal #5: *Students are successfully educated and prepared for life's opportunities.*

The following Improvement Activity has been removed:

Activity 10: *Develop procedures and implement PBIS statewide.*

This improvement activity was removed due to the fact that it was redundant with Improvement Activity 3.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:

Activity 3: *Implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) statewide;*

WDE changed wording of this Improvement Activities to reflect the fact that we have exceeded our expectations of schools participating in this initiative. By the time we added the fourth cohort to the training we had a total of 38 schools involved in the PBIS Initiative.

Activity 10: *Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium*

The WDE Special Programs Unit developed a protocol for providing additional professional development for district educators and administrators with a focus on the needs evidenced through data analysis around the Indicators in the State Performance Plan and the results of the Continuous Improvement/Focused Monitoring. This additional professional development and technical assistance will be provided through a 3-5 day Symposium held before the start of the school year and provided at low to no cost to district personnel. Incentives are provided to districts that send a team of educators (special educators, general educators, related service providers) and administrators (specifically building principals and district superintendents). A variety of topics are covered dispute resolution and discipline requirements under IDEA and strategies for connecting academic standards and instructional strategies for students with significant cognitive impairments.

Activity 11: *Secondary Redesign Project.*

The purpose of the WDE SSR Project is to align selected initiatives, projects, and programs within a planned, coordinated framework and to create an effective and efficient methodology to lead and support the redesign of secondary education in Wyoming. The WDE has formed a Cross-Collaboration Team which brings together staff from all Units in the WDE (Special Programs Unit; Federal Programs; Standards, Assessment & Accountability; Career, Data, Tech; Finance; Health & Safety) for the purpose of examining current data on effective high schools in the US and compare to current data regarding high schools in Wyoming (e.g., student outcome data, resource allocation, staffing levels, schedules, at risk continuum of support, etc). This initiative will bring educators from across the State to the table as we begin to formulate a process for systemic high school reform. Resources for this project will include, but not be limited to, MCREL, NWREL, the *Breaking Ranks Model* from the Northeast Regional Educational Lab, and International Center for Leadership in Education (Dr. Bill Daggett), Model Schools Conference.

Activity 12: *Project Eye to Eye*

WDE is in the initial stages of implementing a mentoring program called *Project Eye to Eye*. The mentoring program includes collaboration between college level students with disabilities and middle school and high school students with disabilities in the transition process. WDE plans to begin by piloting the program with two district populations and the corresponding community college located in that town. The two district populations will include a large district population and a small district population. Both district populations will implement the five *Project Eye to Eye* principles in coordination with the local Community Colleges. Those principles include: 1) Mentoring and Hope; 2) Asset Based Academic Empowerment; 3) Beyond Normal Art Club; 4) Parent Networking and Empowerment; and 5) Professional Development. The mentors are required to attend a *Project Eye to Eye* mentor training before the project begins. Once the mentors are trained the college staff and mentors will work with the district level staff and mentees to arrange places and time for the students and staff to meet. WDE staff will continue to provide technical assistance to the staff, mentors, and mentees. The program will be evaluated by WDE through tying graduation and dropout data to students involved in the program.

Project Eye to Eye Mission: *Project Eye to Eye's* mission is to develop a coalition of mentoring programs for students with learning disabilities and to empower these individuals to celebrate their differences. To achieve this mission, *Project Eye to Eye* will partner with local communities, public, and private schools, universities, and local businesses to bring adults with learning disabilities into the lives of students with learning disabilities.

WDE anticipates positive outcomes for students with disabilities, as well as staff at the universities, middle schools and high schools who are involved in this project.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	13.8% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

School Year	Overall Dropout Rates	Overall Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rates for Students with Disabilities	Number of Dropouts for Students with Disabilities
2005-06	5.60%	1,499	12.9%	419
2006-07	5.30%	1384	7.7%	228

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

On the APR dated February 1, 2007, Wyoming did not have 2005-06 dropout data available. Therefore WDE has included both the FFY 2005 and the current FFY 2006 data as part of the APR submission. Wyoming met the measurable and rigorous target for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. Furthermore, the dropout rate for students with disabilities has greatly improved during the last year and continues to show a downward trend.

Wyoming has been focusing on dropout prevention during the last several years. However we believe a key reason for the decrease in the state’s dropout rate is the state’s ability to now track the dropout rate to the student level. The WISER ID Numbers (unique individual identification numbers) used throughout the public school system allow the WDE to track students who appear on end-of-year special education data collections as a dropout and then return to school in the fall to continue their education. The ability to cross check individual identification numbers allows districts to properly report and receive credit for those students who may require more than four years to graduate. WDE looks forward to the continued improvement of the drop out rates for all school districts in the State. If this trend continues WDE may consider modifying the Indicator #2 targets for the 2009 submission of the APR. As is Indicator #1, this indicator is also a critical component of the WDE Strategic Plan.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Assist the WDE in addressing systemic graduation and dropout issues for student with disabilities.*

Graduation and drop out rate data by district were used as a component of the 2006-2007 Continuous Improvement/Focused Monitoring Process conducted by the WDE. Tying these data to compliance in the areas of IEP provisions/requirements in Part B of the IDEA 34 CFR §§300.320 through 300.324, FAPE (§300.101) and Highly Qualified Personnel (§300.156 (a) and (b)) became a focus of on-site monitoring. Districts with poor outcome data for students with disabilities were targeted for monitoring and technical assistance in providing research-based interventions for students with disabilities through the IEP and transition planning process. The monitoring process connecting outcomes to compliance is explained in detail in the discussion section of Indicator #15.

Activity 2: *Support and disseminate information regarding the development/implementation of system changes (e.g. vocational opportunities, PBIS, RTI and analyze results to determine effectiveness in reducing dropout rates).*

Through the PBIS Initiative, districts are receiving technical assistance in addressing students who are at an increased risk of dropping out as a result of behavioral issues. The 38 schools in the PBIS initiative receive training on behavioral interventions, on-site technical support, and assistance in data collection and analysis in order to identify targeted at-risk populations. One major component of the PBIS process is the systems approach of developing and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. As the PBIS initiative continues, the State will be able to demonstrate how the decrease in severe behavioral incidences impacts the State's dropout rate.

The RTI Initiative is providing support to districts to implement a systematic model of data analysis, problem-solving and instructional practices matched to student need. One of the purposes of successful implementation of RTI is to identify struggling learners early, provide high quality instruction and intervention, monitor student progress and prevent a cycle of academic failure that may ultimately result in the student dropping out of school.

Schools and districts are supported in RTI implementation through the use of a cohort model of intensive training and support for selected schools. The RTI initiative, funded through the SPDG, is in the fourth year of implementation. Statewide trainings are also provided at the School Improvement Conference, an annual RTI one-day conference and the Teton Institute.

Student achievement data from the PBIS and RTI cohort schools is being collected and analyzed. All the schools involved in the current RTI initiative are elementary schools. There are a variety of schools in the PBIS initiatives. They are mostly elementary schools; however, we have one district-wide that includes the secondary level.

The WDE will add a new PBIS and RTI cohort group each year through 2010.

WDE sponsored attendance of members of the Transition Council at national conferences addressing dropout prevention. Members returned to the state to make presentations in order to disperse information to districts and organizations throughout the state. This practice will continue as the State strives to build its internal capacity to provide model programs of excellence and coaches and mentors in district around the State.

WDE coordinated a conference focusing on the educational impact of poverty and homelessness. One strand of the conference addressed challenges faced by students with disabilities.

Activity 3: *WDE will continue contact with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities and the Community of Practice (CoP) for guidance and support.*

WDE sponsored attendance by members of the Transition Council to national conferences addressing dropout prevention. They were charged with disseminating information regarding “best practices” around drop-out-prevention strategies to districts throughout the state. WDE has formed an At Risk Task Force to examine the data regarding dropout rates of the general population as well as students with disabilities. One of the goals included in the WDE Strategic Plan is to reduce the number of students in Wyoming who are dropping out of high school. A consultant from the Special Programs Unit, who has been involved with the National Dropout Prevention Center’s work, is a member of that Task Force. This practice will continue as the State strives to build its internal capacity to provide model programs of excellence and coaches and mentors in districts around the State experiencing high dropout rates.

Activity 4: *Collaborate with LEAs not meeting AYP and the Assessment and Accountability Units to ensure that Targeted Intervention Plans for dropout/graduation addresses unique needs of students with disabilities.*

Participate in the technical assistance PEP (Pillars of Education Progress) talks provided by the Assessment and Accountability Unit, to districts who are not meeting AYP targets. Districts with poor outcome data for students with disabilities were targeted for technical assistance in providing research-based interventions for students with disabilities through the IEP. This monitoring process connecting compliance to outcomes is explained in detail in the discussion section of Indicator #15.

Activity 6: *Continue activities involving low incidence populations to improve completion of secondary education and move into successful post secondary activities.*

Based upon data regarding post school outcomes for low incidence populations (specifically Deaf/Hard of Hearing and Visually Impaired) the WDE placed a strong emphasis on transition and effective instructional strategies for teachers and service providers of these students. These programs included: The Wyoming Deaf-Blind Project which provided trainings to address needs of students with visual impairments, hearing impairments, deafness, blindness and multiple disabilities. Communication Matrix Assessment – how to determine current levels of communication ability and set future communication goals; Every Move Counts: Sensory-Based Strategies for Identifying Appropriate Technological Interventions for Individuals with Severe and Profound Differences; Emergent to Transitional to Conventional Literacy: Moving Through the Beginning Literacy Framework – supporting literacy development for upper elementary, middle and secondary students with severe disabilities, and Emergent Literacy for Students: A Project Based Approach – addressing literacy needs for older students through the application of project based learning.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE continues to analyze data and adjust improvement activities and timelines accordingly. As WDE has examined dropout data concerning youth with disabilities for the past two years and worked with districts to improve transition planning for these students, additions have been made to the Improvement Activities, reflecting necessary changes. Additional resources and activities have been added to the State Performance Plan for Indicator #2. Cross Collaborative Teams (CCT) have been established across the WDE for the purpose of examining technical assistance and improvement activities regarding dropout rates. It is a critical component of the WDE Strategic Plan and that of the State Board of Education and ties into the Governor’s Wyoming Education Quality of Life Result/Goal #5: *Students are successfully educated and prepared for life’s opportunities.*

The following Improvement Activity has been removed:**Activity 5:** *Explore alternative avenues for students to meet high school graduation requirements.*

This improvement activity has been removed from the SPP. At the time that the SPP was developed, this activity was a focus of the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities. It has been determined that rather than exploring alternate routes to graduation (which are set in state statute and rule), we will continue to work with Cross Collaboration Teams to ensure that appropriate accommodations including Universal Design are considered as the State guides districts in developing the “body of evidence” that defines proficiency toward standards and meets the graduation requirements.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:**Activity 5:** (becomes) *Project Eye to Eye*

WDE is in the initial stages of implementing a mentoring program called *Project Eye to Eye*. The mentoring program includes collaboration between college level students with disabilities and middle school and high school students with disabilities in the transition process. WDE plans to begin by piloting the program with two district populations and the corresponding community college located in that town. The two district populations will include a large district population and a small district population. Both district populations will implement the five *Project Eye to Eye* principles in coordination with the local Community Colleges. Those principles include: 1) Mentoring and Hope; 2) Asset Based Academic Empowerment; 3) Beyond Normal Art Club; 4) Parent Networking and Empowerment; and 5) Professional Development. The mentors are required to attend a *Project Eye to Eye* mentor training before the project begins. Once the mentors are trained the college staff and mentors will work with the district level staff and mentees to arrange places and time for the students and staff to meet. WDE staff will continue to provide technical assistance to the staff, mentors, and mentees. The program will be evaluated by WDE through tying graduation and dropout data to students involved in the program.

Project Eye to Eye Mission: *Project Eye to Eye's* mission is to develop a coalition of mentoring programs for students with learning disabilities and to empower these individuals to celebrate their differences. To achieve this mission, *Project Eye to Eye* will partner with local communities, public, and private schools, universities, and local businesses to bring adults with learning disabilities into the lives of students with learning disabilities.

WDE anticipates positive outcomes for students with disabilities, as well as staff at the universities, middle schools and high schools who are involved in this project.

Activity 8: *Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium*

The WDE Special Programs Unit developed a protocol for providing additional professional development for district educators and administrators with a focus on the needs evidenced through data analysis around the Indicators in the State Performance Plan and the results of the Continuous Improvement/Focused Monitoring. This additional professional development and technical assistance will be provided through a 3-5 day Symposium held before the start of the school year and provided at low to no cost to district personnel. Incentives are provided to districts that send a team of educators (special educators, general educators, related service providers) and administrators (specifically building principals and district superintendents). A variety of topics are covered from dispute resolution and discipline requirements under IDEA and to strategies for connecting academic standards and instructional strategies to the most significantly cognitively impaired students (1% alternate assessment).

Activity 9: Secondary School Redesign (SSR)

The purpose of the WDE SSR Project is to align selected initiatives, projects, and programs within a planned, coordinated framework and to create an effective and efficient methodology to lead and support the redesign of secondary education in Wyoming. The WDE has formed a Cross-Collaboration Team which brings together staff from all Units in the WDE (Special Programs Unit; Federal Programs; Standards, Assessment & Accountability; Career, Data, Tech; Finance; Health & Safety) for the purpose of examining current data on effective high schools in the US and compare to current data regarding high schools in Wyoming (e.g., student outcome data, resource allocation, staffing levels, schedules, at risk continuum of support, etc). This initiative will bring educators from across the State to the table as we begin to formulate a process for systemic high school reform. Resources for this project will include, but not be limited to, MCREL, NWREL, the *Breaking Ranks Model* from the Northeast Regional Educational Lab, and International Center for Leadership in Education (Dr. Bill Daggett), Model Schools Conference.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State})] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

- C. Proficiency rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

3A. PERCENT OF DISTRICTS MEETING STATE AYP OBJECTIVES FOR PROGRESS FOR DISABILITIES SUBGROUP

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	Language Arts Elementary – 69% , Middle – 43% , High – 43% Math Elementary – 69% , Middle – 51% , High – 20%

3B. PARTICIPATION RATE

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	All Levels - Language Arts = 100% All Levels - Math = 100%

3C. PROFICIENCY RATE

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	Elementary-Language Arts = 42% ; Middle-Language Arts = 45.42% ; High-Language Arts = 57% Elementary-Math = 36.5% ; Middle-Math = 37.75% ; High-Math = 46.5%

Actual Target Data for FFY2006

Display 3-1: 3A. DISTRICTS MEETING AYP

2006-2007	% Districts Meeting AYP * and # of Districts Meeting AYP/Districts with a subgroup n>30 by grade level**			
	Language Arts (%)	Language Arts (n)	Math (%)	Math (n)
Elementary	96.7%	29/30	100.0%	30/30
Middle	93.3%	14/15	80.0%	12/15
High	33.3%	1/3	33.3%	1/3

Display 3-2 3B. PARTICIPATION RATE

Indicator 3 Measurement B part:	2006-07 IEP Assessment PARTICIPATION						
	Subject	Reading			Math		
	Grade	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
	Exempt	10	1	1	10	1	1
	Not Tested	55	48	40	39	39	29
B #	Tested Regular Assessment Without Accommodations	1791	800	294	1807	882	299
C #	Tested Regular Assessment With Accommodations	1761	837	258	1754	763	259
D #	Tested Alternate Assessment at Grade Level Standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
E #	Tested Alternate Assessment at Alternate Standards	237	102	38	244	103	43
(b+c+d+e) #	TOTAL Tested	3789	1738	590	3805	1748	601
a #	TOTAL Tested + Not Tested + Exempt	3854	1788	631	3854	1788	631
b / a %	Tested Regular Assessment Without Accommodations	46.47%	44.74%	46.59%	46.89%	49.33%	47.39%
c / a %	Tested Regular Assessment With Accommodations	45.69%	46.81%	40.89%	45.51%	42.67%	41.05%
d / a %	Tested Alternate Assessment at Grade Level Standards	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
e / a %	Tested Alternate Assessment at Alternate Standards	6.15%	5.70%	6.02%	6.33%	5.76%	6.81%
(b+c+d+e) / a %	Participation Rate - Overall IEP %	98.31%	97.26%	93.50%	98.73%	97.76%	95.25%

Display 3-3 3C. PROFICIENCY RATE

Indicator 3 Measurement C part:	2006-07 Students with Disability Statewide Assessment PROFICIENCY						
	Subject	Reading			Math		
	Grade	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
b #	Tested PROFICIENT Regular Assessment Without Accommodations	777	237	86	1,218	268	44
c #	Tested PROFICIENT Regular Assessment With Accommodations	450	186	52	948	174	35
d #	Tested PROFICIENT Alternate Assessment at Grade Level Standards	0	0	0	0	0	0
e #	Tested PROFICIENT Alternate Assessment at Alternate Standards	193	80	34	177	75	40
(b+c+d+e) #	TOTAL "n" Tested PROFICIENT or ABOVE	1,420	503	172	2,343	517	119
a #	TOTAL Tested Proficient or Non-Proficient	3789	1738	590	3805	1748	601
(b+c+d+e) / a %	TOTAL % Tested Proficient or Above	37.5%	28.9%	29.2%	61.6%	29.6%	19.8%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Valid and Reliable Data:

The scores that are reported here are obtained through the WDE Standards, Assessment & Accountability Unit after they have been through a rigorous process of validation and adjudication. Measurements A, B, and C are based on scores from the Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS) and the PAWS-ALT. Test administration follows strict procedures which are monitored by WDE staff. The same scores are reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report to the OESE of the USDE. The Special Programs Unit is confident in their accuracy.

3A. Four out of the six targets for 3A were met.

Wyoming met its targets in elementary math and middle school language arts. WDE believes progress was achieved through the rigorous plans developed by districts and the WDE School Improvement staff. The targets for this indicator mirror those established in the State's Accountability Workbook for the purposes of meeting the requirements set forth in the NCLB Act.

	Language Arts	Math
Elementary	Met target	Met target
Middle	Met target	Met target
High	Did not meet target	Did not meet target

3B. Zero out of the six targets for 3B were met. However, all of the categories (elementary, middle and high school; reading and mathematics) exceeded the NCLB target of 95% participation. The sole exception was high school student participation in PAWS reading testing, which missed the NCLB target by 1.5%.

	Language Arts	Math
Elementary	Did not meet target	Did not meet target
Middle	Did not meet target	Did not meet target
High	Did not meet target	Did not meet target

3C. Wyoming met its proficiency target in elementary math only. The targets for this indicator mirror those established in the State's Accountability Workbook for the purposes of meeting the requirements set forth in the NCLB Act. The WDE Special Programs Unit examines data for growth in each category even when targets are not achieved. Improvement Activities will also continue and/or be adjusted in order to improve proficiency rates for Wyoming's students with disabilities.

	Language Arts	Math
Elementary	Did not meet target	Met target
Middle	Did not meet target	Did not meet target
High	Did not meet target	Did not meet target

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006

As can be seen in Display 3-4, great progress was made on the percent of districts meeting AYP for the student with disabilities subgroup. Close to 100% of both elementary school and middle school districts met AYP for the students with disabilities subgroup this year compared to typically one-third to two-thirds of districts in prior years.

Display 3-5 indicates that the participation rate for students with disabilities has slightly decreased since FFY 2004. However, most participation rates are still above 95% (the NCLB requirement). We continue

to see areas of concern involving high school participation rates. Ensuring participation can be more challenging at the high school level, especially in alternative high school settings. Any district that reports participation rates below the NCLB requirement of 95% is asked to submit a plan (part of the District/School Improvement Plan for NCA) for improving the participation rate during the next administration of the PAWS/PAWS-ALT.

As can be seen in Display 3-6, proficiency rates for students have increased over time. All rates have increased by at least 15 percentage points from FFY 2005-2006. Local educators, administrators and boards of education have made concerted effort to improve the educational process for all students by implementing scientific, research-based instructional practices across all grade levels. There is a strong emphasis on providing appropriate, research-based interventions to students through such initiatives as Professional Learning Communities, Reading First Initiatives and Response to Intervention Initiatives. The Wyoming Legislators passed a bill which funds Instructional Facilitators for every school in Wyoming. These facilitators help to guide the implementation of research-based instructional strategies and programs with fidelity through coaching, mentoring and training. The WDE provides on-going training opportunities for the Instructional Facilitators.

Additionally, WDE Special Programs Unit staff used the data from this indicator as a priority for the Continuous Improvement/Focused Monitoring System during the 2006-2007 school year. Outcome data were tied to the related requirements of state and districtwide assessment; §§300.320 through 300.324 IEP provisions; §300.101(a) FAPE; §300.207 highly qualified staff. Findings of noncompliance are reported in Indicator #15. Districts were required to develop Corrective Action Plans for areas of noncompliance. The WDE looked for patterns of noncompliance in the priority areas in order to address systemic issues during Regional Trainings and the Leadership Symposium as well as providing on-site technical assistance with WDE staff or our partners at MPRRC – TAESE.

Display 3-4: Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for the Students with Disabilities Subgroup, Results Over Time

	2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	2005-2006 (FFY 2005)	2006-2007 (FFY 2006)
Language Arts – Elementary Schools	62.5%	30.0%	96.7%
Language Arts – Middle Schools	33.3%	35.7%	93.3%
Language Arts – High Schools	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%
Math – Elementary Schools	62.5%	93.3%	100.0%
Math – Middle Schools	44.4%	33.3%	80.0%
Math – High Schools	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%

Display 3-5: Participation Rate of Students with Disabilities, Results Over Time

	2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	2005-2006 (FFY 2005)	2006-2007 (FFY 2006)
Language Arts – Elementary Schools	99.1%	98.8%	98.3%
Language Arts – Middle Schools	99.0%	97.8%	97.3%
Language Arts – High Schools	98.9%	95.5%	93.5%
Math – Elementary Schools	99.2%	98.7%	98.7%
Math – Middle Schools	99.0%	97.9%	97.8%

Math – High Schools	98.7%	95.2%	95.3%
---------------------	-------	-------	-------

Display 3-6: Proficiency Rate of Students with Disabilities, Results Over Time

	2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	2005-2006 (FFY 2005)	2006-2007 (FFY 2006)
Language Arts – Elementary Schools	14.8%	29.5%	37.5%
Language Arts – Middle Schools	9.5%	21.3%	28.9%
Language Arts – High Schools	10.5%	19.9%	29.2%
Math – Elementary Schools	20.1%	40.6%	61.6%
Math – Middle Schools	8.0%	17.6%	29.6%
Math – High Schools	8.3%	15.1%	19.8%

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming’s SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Provide research-based strategies during statewide conferences and professional development opportunities for LEA staff to increase academic performance of students with disabilities*

WDE facilitated several activities for LEA staff including but not limited to the following: Wyoming Paraeducators Conference (WyPEC) in August 2006, RTI Cohort Trainings in October 2007, and School Improvement Conference presentations in September 2006 and March 2007.

The 6th Annual Teton Institute held in July in Jackson Hole, WY. Some 578 educators from across Wyoming and surrounding states (and as far away as the Samoan Islands) attended this training opportunity sponsored in partnership with Sopris West of Cambium Learning. Sessions focused upon the implementation of the RTI process aimed at improving student outcomes; research-based instructional strategies in math and reading; implementation of research-based practices for PBIS; leadership skills in the change process and implementation steps. High Priority Schools (schools not meeting AYP) were offered tuition waivers in order to bring teams of teachers to the Institute.

The WDE began work this past year with the fourth cohort of schools involved in the implementation of Schoolwide PBIS. WDE continues a contract with Dr. Jeff Sprague and colleagues at the PBIS Center at the University of Oregon. The emphasis with the schools in first three cohorts was on building the capacity in their districts/schools to sustain the efforts of the PBIS teams, train coaches, and use data to make needed strategy changes. All of these schools are reporting data through SWIS which allows the State to review data and progress in these schools. Achievement data is also carefully reviewed for the districts in their third year of implementation to draw correlations between the PBIS and positive trends in achievement for all students, but particularly students with disabilities. Data are showing positive trends in these schools. These data are shared with educators and administrators from across the State through presentations at the annual spring School Improvement Conference and the Leadership Symposium.

PBIS was a major focus of the 6th Annual Teton Institute held in Jackson Hole in partnership with Cambium Learning’s Sopris West. This continues to be a very positive a professional development opportunity attended by over 500 educators from WY, surrounding states, and as far away as the Samoan Islands.

Through the PBIS Initiative, districts are receiving technical assistance in addressing students who are at an increased risk of dropping out as a result of behavioral issues. The 38 schools in the PBIS initiative receive training on behavioral interventions, on-site technical support, and assistance in data collection and analysis in order to identify targeted at-risk populations. One major component of the PBIS process is the systems approach of developing and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. As the PBIS initiative continues, the State will be able to demonstrate how the decrease in severe behavioral incidences impacts the outcome indicators for the State.

Activity 2: *Staff training in administering the PAWS and PAWS-ALT*

Staff from the WDE's Special Education Unit and Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Unit collaborated with Harcourt Assessment to provide regional trainings on PAWS-ALT administration. Day-long trainings occurred in January 2007, and they were held in various regional locations in order to facilitate LEA staff attendance. FAQ documents were developed and placed on the WDE website at the conclusion of the trainings, and one complete training session was videotaped and placed on the WDE website so it could be viewed by those unable to attend in person.

In addition, regional trainings for the PAWS were held during October and November of 2006. The use of testing accommodations was discussed at each training session, and a separate full-day session on accommodations was held in Casper on November 6, 2006. This session was a "train the trainer" approach and district teams who attended were asked to return to their LEAs and train additional staff.

Activity 3: *Implement the PAWS-ALT based on Wyoming Academic Content Standards*

The second annual administration of the PAWS-ALT began in February of 2006 and ended in April of 2007. The state plans to continue its annual administration of this assessment to qualified students with significant cognitive disabilities, although the assessment was refined during the summer and fall of 2007 in order to meet peer review requirements. The WDE looks forward to explaining the changes made to the PAWS-ALT in its Annual Performance Report for FFY 2007.

Activity 4: *Provide training and information on Rtl to schools who are not participating in the pilot program*

WDE facilitated several RTI training and informational activities for LEA staff including but not limited to the following: RTI Kickoff event in March of 2007 and School Improvement Conference presentations in September 2006 and March 2007. Additionally, the WDE Special Programs Unit hosted the Sixth Annual Teton Institute for nearly 600 participants, which included strands on behavior support, literacy, differentiated instruction, RTI and other topics. High Priority Schools (schools not meeting AYP) were offered tuition waivers.

Activity 6: *Analyze PAWS and PAWS-ALT data to determine if assessment process (including accommodations and modifications) requires adjustment*

WDE staff continue to meet regularly with the state's Technical Advisory Committee for State Assessment Recommendations, and WDE consultants are active in the CCSSO's State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) workgroup on Assessing Special Education Students (ASES). In addition, the WDE made significant changes to Wyoming's state assessment system during the spring, summer, and fall of 2007. These changes were spurred by requirements of the peer review process, and the state looks forward to discussing them in the Annual Performance Report for FFY 2007. Through these efforts, the State aims to keep its assessment system among the finest in the nation.

Activity 8: *Establishment of a statewide procedure for agencies electing to use RTI as an identification strategy for SLD.*

The WDE, in collaboration with MPRRC, brought together a task force of key stakeholders. Those stakeholders represented local special education directors, school psychologists and educational diagnosticians, building principals, PIC/PEN, Protection and Advocacy and the University of Wyoming. This group met six times from November 2006 through September 2007 to review and research various states' RTI guidance documents, the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD) toolkit, and discuss sub-group recommendations. The WDE draft procedure document was sent electronically to all district superintendents, building principals, and directors of special education. Districts were invited to submit an application to the WDE that describes their RTI process and procedures in order to field-test the procedure document.

The stakeholder group will re-convene at the end of the 2007-2008 school year to re-examine this document, provide feedback on the suitability of the document and make suggestions for necessary revisions before it becomes a final document.

Activity 9: *Identify successful model reading and math programs in districts meeting AYP for students with disabilities subgroup.*

WDE Special Programs staff members collaborated with the school improvement unit in providing technical assistance to schools not meeting AYP. During technical assistance meetings, districts that have not made AYP are referred to other districts that have achieved high levels of proficiency (90% and above) for the students with disabilities subgroup. Districts are encouraged to explore the use of these successful reading and mathematics programs.

WDE Special Programs staff members have worked closely this past year with the staff involved in the Reading First Initiative. Their collaboration has included the work on an RTI Stakeholder Group who is examining the implementation issues of RTI as a general school improvement model.

Scientific, research-based reading and math programs and instructional strategies were presented at the 6th annual Teton Institute. Our partnership with Steven Kukic and his staff at Sopris West has been of great benefit to the educators in Wyoming and surrounding states. The Institute program can be viewed at <http://www.sopriswest.com/>.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE continues to analyze data and adjust improvement activities and timelines accordingly. As WDE has examined assessment data concerning youth with disabilities for the past two years and worked with districts to improve instructional strategies and implement research-based interventions for these students, additions have been made to the Improvement Activities, reflecting necessary changes. Additional resources and activities have been added to the State Performance Plan for Indicator #3. Cross Collaborative Teams (CCT) have been established across the WDE for the purpose of examining technical assistance and improvement activities regarding participation rates, AYP and proficiency rates for students with disabilities. It is a critical component of the WDE Strategic Plan and that of the State Board of Education and ties into the Governor's Wyoming Education Quality of Life Result/Goal #5: *Students are successfully educated and prepared for life's opportunities.*

In order to align with Wyoming's Accountability Workbook and to be consistent with all other federal reporting, AYP reporting includes math and language arts but assessment reporting includes math and reading. The Accountability Workbook will be revised during FFY 2007 and upon approval by the OESE of the USDE, any revisions in that document that affect this Indicator will be reflected in the 2009 APR.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:

Activity 3: *Implement the PAWS-ALT based on Wyoming Academic Content Standards*

The dates for this activity will indicate that the implementation process will have been completed during the FFY 2007.

Activity 7: *Analyze PAWS and PAWS-ALT data and adjust targets as needed.*

PAWS and PAWS-ALT data are analyzed annually and used in a variety of ways (LEA determinations, LEA Report Cards, Monitoring Site Selection, etc.). As this is a requirement of NCLB and IDEA, this activity will be removed from Indicator 3 as an Improvement Activity. It is anticipated that Wyoming's Accountability Workbook revisions will be completed and approved by the OESE during FFY 2007. It will include the flexibility of allowing districts to count students who are no longer disabled in the IEP subgroup for two years.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.*

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.*

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions

Wyoming did not report data for 4b in accordance with OSEP’s instructions in the Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

4A. Districts identified as having significant discrepancy FFY 2006

District	District Enrollment of Students with Disabilities	District Count of Students with Disabilities Suspended/Expelled	District Rate for Suspension/Expulsion of Students with Disabilities
District #1	259	1	0.39%
District #2	1587	6	0.38%
District #3	130	1	0.77%
District #4	1509	8	0.53%
District #5	286	1	0.35%
District #6	407	3	0.74%
District #7	18	1	5.56%
District #8	634	4	0.63%
District #9	396	1	0.25%
District #10	239	2	0.84%
District #11	400	4	1.00%
District #12	108	1	0.93%
District #13	273	1	0.37%

Thirty-five (35) Wyoming school districts reported no suspensions or expulsions for students with disabilities; 14 developmental preschool regions reported no suspension or expulsions for students with disabilities.

Listed in the table above are those thirteen districts which reported at least one student with disabilities with a suspension or expulsion. Applying the definition of "significant discrepancy" WDE identified that none of the districts with suspensions or expulsions met both prongs of the criteria. No district in the state of Wyoming suspended or expelled two or more students at a rate greater than 5% of their population of special education students.

Therefore, the percent of the school districts in Wyoming identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities is equal to 0%.

For FFY 2006, WY met the target of 0% of districts being identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Response to OSEP Concern:

In Wyoming's Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table, OSEP pointed out that the State had not indicated that the review, and if appropriate revision, covered policies, practices and procedures relating to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b). The WDE not only reviewed policies, practices and procedures of these districts, but conducted an on-site Focused Monitoring visit to both districts where policies, procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards were reviewed. As a result of this review neither district was required to revise their policies, procedures, or practices because no evidence was found that indicated non-compliance with 34 CFR §300.170 (b). As a way of ensuring that policies, procedures, and practices in each of the state's school districts are in compliance with 34 CFR

§300.170(b), the WDE is in the process of developing a rubric for districts to use as part of the annual self-assessment requirements. This will aid the WDE in determining compliance and consistency across the state, but especially in cases where data reveal significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion rates of specific districts. Additionally, those districts that demonstrate significant discrepancy will continue to be required to submit their policies, procedures, and practices to the WDE for review using the rubric. This will aid the state and the districts in determining the specific revisions, if any, that need to be made to their policies, procedures, and practices as they relate to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and/or procedural safeguards.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activities 1 & 4 & 11:

- 1) *Analyze and determine districts with significant discrepancy for sub indicator A.*
- 4) *Refine the state definition and reporting procedure for suspension and expulsion.*
- 11) *Participate in WDE Data Quality Council in order to revise the state's data dictionary and create standard reporting definitions.*

The Special Programs Unit staff members were involved in a WDE Data Quality Council this past year. Their many activities included developing a "data dictionary" to be used by the school districts to aid in the submission of accurate data based upon common definitions. In addition, the instructions for each data collection were revised and vastly improved for all data collections, including that of suspension and expulsion data.

The Special Programs Unit also contracted with Data Driven Enterprises for the analysis of data for this indicator. Statisticians for this entity have increased the WDE's capacity to analyze the districts' data for anomalies and significant discrepancies related to suspension and expulsion data. They have also helped the WDE staff provide inservice trainings to the districts in order that they may analyze their own data for use in programming decisions aimed at improved outcomes for all students.

Activity 2: *Review data from pilot districts implementing RTI and PBIS for evidence of improvement in suspension and expulsion rates.*

Through the PBIS Initiative, districts are receiving technical assistance in addressing the needs of students who are at an increased risk of academic failure as a result of behavioral issues. The 38 schools in the PBIS Initiative receive training on behavioral interventions, on-site technical support, and assistance in data collection and analysis in order to identify targeted at-risk populations. One major component of the PBIS process is the systems approach of developing and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. All schools are collecting discipline data using SWIS. These schools are presenting their data at the spring School Improvement Conference to demonstrate the drop in office referrals, suspensions, etc. WDE will examine the PAWS data for these school over the next two years in order to draw a correlation with drop in behavior incidents and rise in academic performance for students in Grades K – 8.

During FFY 2007, the PBIS Initiative will be introduced at the preschool level, targeting the Child Developmental Centers in the 14 Regions across the State. Model sites will be built in one to three centers for the first year.

The RTI Initiative is providing support to districts to implement a systematic model of data analysis, problem-solving and instructional practices matched to student need. One of the purposes of successful implementation of RTI is to identify struggling learners early, provide high quality instruction and intervention, monitor student progress and prevent a cycle of academic failure that may ultimately result in the student dropping out of school. Additionally, as students are more successful academically, behavior incidents tend to decrease. WDE is particularly

interested in the data it is beginning to receive from schools/districts that have implemented PBIS for the past few years and are now implementing the tiered intervention system of RTI.

Schools and districts are supported in RTI implementation through the use of a cohort model of intensive training and support for selected schools. The RTI Initiative, funded through the SPDG, is in the third year of implementation. Statewide trainings are also provided at the School Improvement Conference, an annual RTI one-day conference and the Teton Institute.

Student achievement data from the PBIS and RTI cohort schools is being collected and analyzed. All the schools involved in the current RTI initiative are elementary schools. There are a variety of schools in the PBIS initiatives. They are mostly elementary schools; however, Wyoming has one district-wide that includes the secondary level. Once the WDE has at least 3 years of trend data for these schools/districts, the state will report out on its website, at the School Improvement Conference, Teton Institute and the Leadership Symposium the sites that indicate the most positive data and outcomes for all students (including students with disabilities).

The WDE will add a new PBIS and RTI cohort group each year through 2010.

Activity 5: *Offer professional development annually to identify and provide supports for suspension and expulsion strategies to Wyoming educators through the Teton Institute, RTI and PBIS Initiatives.*

Through the PBIS Initiative, districts are receiving technical assistance in addressing students who are at an increased risk of dropping out as a result of behavioral issues. The 38 schools in the PBIS Initiative receive training on behavioral interventions, on-site technical support, and assistance in data collection and analysis in order to identify targeted at-risk populations. One major component of the PBIS process is the systems approach of developing and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. As the PBIS initiative continues, the State will be able to demonstrate how the decrease in severe behavioral incidences impacts the State's dropout rate.

The RTI Initiative is providing support to districts to implement a systematic model of data analysis, problem-solving and instructional practices matched to student need. One of the purposes of successful implementation of RTI is to identify struggling learners early, provide high quality instruction and intervention, monitor student progress and prevent a cycle of academic failure that may ultimately result in the student dropping out of school.

Schools and districts are supported in RTI implementation through the use of a cohort model of intensive training and support for selected schools. The RTI initiative, funded through the SPDG, is in the fourth year of implementation. Statewide trainings are also provided at the School Improvement Conference, an annual RTI one-day conference and the Teton Institute.

Activity 6: *Review and modify the monitoring process to ensure accuracy and consistency in methodology that LEAs report suspensions and expulsions:*

This activity relates to the steps outlines in Activities 1 and 4, in that all data collections have been examined carefully by WDE staff over the past year. Additionally, the Special Program staff while conducting data-based Focused Monitoring activities cross-reference data that is reported with actual records kept by the districts. While verifying compliance, the WDE staff is also providing technical assistance during these on-site monitoring visits to ensure district staff are collecting and reporting data accurately and consistent with the data requirements.

Activity 11: *Provide technical assistance to building administrators responsible for district discipline policy implementation*

The WDE contracted with MPRRC to provide a professional development session focused on training for principals and administrators regarding compliance with expulsion and suspension of special education students at the Wyoming School Improvement Conference. Lenore Knudson, Esq., presented information regarding compliance with the discipline procedures in Part B of the

IDEA. Included in her presentation were strategies and tools that building principals could implement immediately in their buildings. Documents from her presentation were then disseminated electronically to all local special education directors for use in training their own staff. WDE will continue to provide guidance tools via its web page and sessions at the fall and spring School Improvement Conferences and the Leadership Symposium regarding discipline “pit falls.”

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE continues to analyze data and adjust improvement activities and timelines accordingly. As WDE has examined suspension/expulsion data concerning youth with disabilities for the past two years and worked with districts to implement research-based interventions for these students, additions have been made to the Improvement Activities, reflecting necessary changes. Additional resources and activities have been added to the State Performance Plan for Indicator 4. Cross Collaborative Teams (CCT) have been established across the WDE for the purpose of examining technical assistance and improvement activities regarding suspension/expulsion rates. Work has continued with staff involved in Title IV, Safe and Drug Free Schools Act and a Coordinated School Health Initiative.

The following Improvement Activity has been removed:

Activity 7: *Determine indicator “B” baseline and rigorous targets.*

This activity will be removed from this indicator as it has to do specifically with 4B. In Wyoming’s Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table, OSEP informed the State that the use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns and as a result, OSEP has decided not to review this year’s submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval. We will wait until the instructions are revised to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. At this time, we have ceased data collection for Indicator 4B measurements and targets.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
2006	Measurement A <21%	Measurement B >60%	Measurement C Separate %
2006-2007)	Greater than 57.00%	Less than 9.52%	Less than 2.45%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

2006	<21% Outside Regular Classroom	Number of Students <21% Outside Regular Classroom	>60% Outside Regular Classroom	Number of Students >60% Outside Regular Classroom	Combined Separate Facilities	Number of Students Combined Separate Facilities
2006-2007	57.32% Met Target	6738	8.62% Met Target	1,013	2.76% Did Not Meet Target	325

Total number of students with disabilities used for calculation = 11,755. This represents the number of students with IEPs in Wyoming ages 6 through 21 based on Child Count of December 2006.

- 5A – the target of Greater than 57.00% was met with actual target data of 57.32%.
- 5B – the target of Less than 9.52% was met with the actual target data of 8.62%.
- 5C – the target of less than 2.45% was not met with the actual target data of 2.76%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The WDE met its targets for two of the sub-indicators (5a and 5b). Indicator 5a was a priority indicator in the state's Continuous Improvement - Focused Monitoring system and the districts that were most responsible for negatively affecting this percentage were, in fact, monitored on-site. Findings of non-compliance related to this and other areas were addressed in the districts' corrective action plans. Corrective Action Plans (CAP) are currently in place to address areas of non-compliance and to facilitate continued improvement in this area.

The WDE did not meet its target for sub-indicator 5c. The data for 5c was further analyzed by the WDE to reveal that for 46 students in this category no member of the IEP team was involved in the placement of the student. The placement decision was actually court-ordered through the judicial process in the county in which the students resided. For the students whose placements were actually made by IEP teams and/or parents, the percentage of students in separate school settings is 2.38%. Although the input from districts in placement decisions is limited for court-ordered placed students on IEPs, the state understands their obligation to assist and educate districts in their responsibility and involvement and the assurance of FAPE for these students. The WDE remains committed to providing that guidance for districts with court-ordered placed students, parentally-placed students, as well as those placed by district's IEP teams.

School districts and stakeholders continue to report that limited resources for students with low-incidence disabilities, contribute to those students being placed in residential settings outside of Wyoming. With continued effort and collaboration on early intervention, the WDE hopes to see fewer students placed in out-of-state facilities as more of these children can be successful in their local schools.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Conduct study of the number of students with IEPs in residential placement to determine the yearly average of court-placed students with IEPs in residential institutions.*

The WDE developed a data-collection system to be used to collect information from institutional settings, including the Wyoming Girls' School, Wyoming Boys' School, the Regional BOCES residential settings, and private institutions across the State who currently provide services for students with disabilities who are court placed. Data will be collected initially during the FFY 2007. Data will be presented at the Leadership Symposium along with professional development opportunities for staff from the institutions (residential facilities).

Activity 2: *Identify and provide supports to regular and special education and pre-service teachers so diverse learners may receive scientifically research-based instruction in the regular classroom through the Teton Institute, RTI, PBIS Initiative.*

Through the PBIS Initiative, districts are receiving technical assistance in addressing students who are at an increased risk of dropping out as a result of behavioral issues. The 38 schools in the PBIS Initiative receive training on behavioral interventions, on-site technical support, and assistance in data collection and analysis in order to identify targeted at-risk populations. One major component of the PBIS process is the systems approach of developing and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. As the PBIS initiative continues, the State will be able to

demonstrate how the decrease in severe behavioral incidences impacts the State's more restrictive setting rate.

The RTI Initiative is providing support to districts to implement a systematic model of data analysis, problem-solving and instructional practices matched to student need. One of the purposes of successful implementation of RTI is to identify struggling learners early, provide high quality instruction and intervention, monitor student progress and prevent a cycle of academic failure.

Schools and districts are supported in RTI implementation through the use of a cohort model of intensive training and support for selected schools. The RTI initiative, funded through the SPDG, is in the fourth year of implementation. Statewide trainings are also provided at the School Improvement Conference, an annual RTI one-day conference and the Teton Institute.

Activity 5: *Continue cross-unit collaboration toward overall school improvement activities.*

Special Programs Unit staff worked with staff members from the School Improvement, Assessment & Accountability Unit with the RTI Initiative funded by the SPDG. That initiative has been described in some detail in the Activity 2. Special Programs staff also worked collaboratively with staff involved with the Court-Order-Placed Students (COPS). Training and technical assistance were provided to staff in the institutions providing services for students with disabilities. Additionally, the WDE worked closely with the Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center starting in FFY 2006 to develop a three-tiered approach to providing technical assistance to districts. Tier One Districts will receive technical assistance through the WDE dissemination of resources and materials electronically and via professional development activities. Tier Two Districts will receive technical assistance through a combination of resources and on-site technical assistance required for school improvement efforts (data-based) and compliance with state and federal requirements (NCLB, IDEA, Perkins, etc.). Tier Three Districts because of their student outcome data and multiple areas of noncompliance with state and federal requirements will be assigned a WDE coach who will work on a regularly scheduled basis with the district to examine systems (e.g., fiscal, personnel, instruction, etc.).

Activity 6: *Utilize specially-trained consultants to assist in the education program planning and staff training related to young children with low-incidence disabilities.*

The WDE Special Programs Unit provides outreach services to preschools and school district staff for the provision of appropriate services for children who are deaf/hard of hearing and visually impaired. Staff members work with preschool staff to follow up with young children who have been screened and have evidence of hearing impairments. Staff members also work with preschools to provide vision screenings and work with children who are identified as having visual impairments.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:

Activity 7: *WDE will conduct Regional Trainings related to the development of model IEP forms and the implementation of Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities.*

The Regional Trainings will focus on the requirements of IDEA 04 and Chapter 7 Rules through the use of the WDE Model IEP forms. Emphasis will be placed on areas of non-compliance that have been evidenced in districts monitored during the spring of 2007. Trainings will be conducted during the fall months in five cities across the State in order to allow districts and public agencies to send special education teachers, related service providers, school psychologists, etc. to a

training close to their schools. Regional trainings will be conducted again in the spring to emphasize (given input from monitoring and needs of local districts and public agencies) those areas that have been most challenging to implement. Evaluations obtained at each training will help determine the need and format of continued trainings.

Activity 8: *Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium*

The WDE Special Programs Unit developed a protocol for providing additional professional development for district educators and administrators with a focus on the needs evidenced through data analysis around the Indicators in the State Performance Plan and the results of the Continuous Improvement/Focused Monitoring. This additional professional development and technical assistance will be provided through a 3-5 day Symposium held before the start of the school year and provided at low to no cost to district personnel. Incentives are provided to districts that send a team of educators (special educators, general educators, related service providers) and administrators (specifically building principals and district superintendents). A variety of topics are covered from dispute resolution and discipline requirements under IDEA and to strategies for connecting academic standards and instructional strategies to the most significantly cognitively impaired students (1% alternate assessment).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(A))

Measurement: Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

The Preschools and the School Districts set unique targets as outlined in the SPP. The results are reported separately for Indicator #8 to reflect the results of the different surveys.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets School districts (Kdg through Grade 12+)
2006 (2006-2007)	52.15%* of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

*The targets for this indicator have been reset due to a data error in the reporting in FFY 2005 in the SPP. The explanation is included under the *Revision with Justification Section of this Indicator*.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Display 8-1: Percent of Parents Who Report that the School Facilitated Their Involvement

	FFY 2006
Total number of Parent respondents	759
Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	445
Percentage who reported school facilitated their involvement	58.6%

The target of 52.15% was met for the school districts.

In FFY 2006, the survey was distributed to a stratified, representative sample of 3,739 parents of children receiving special education services. A total of 759 surveys were returned for a response rate of 20.3%.

To arrive at the percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement, a “percent of maximum” scoring procedure was used. Each survey respondent received a percent of maximum score based on their responses to all 25 items. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “6”

(Very Strongly Agree) on each of the 25 items received a 100% score; a respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “1” (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the 25 items received a 0% score. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “4” (Agree) on each of the 25 items received a 60% score. (Note: a respondent who **on average** rated their experiences a “4”, e.g., a respondent who rated 7 items a “4,” 9 items a “3” and 9 items a “5,” would also receive a percent of maximum score of 60%.) A parent who has a percent of maximum score of 60% or above was identified as one who reported that the school facilitated his/her involvement. A 60% cut-score is representative of a parent who, on average, agrees with each item; as such, the family member is agreeing that school facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for their child.

Reliability and Validity

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children whose parents responded to the survey to those of all special education students in the state. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the race/ethnicity of the child; (3) by the grade level of the child; and (4) by the primary disability of the child. Parents of children who are white were slightly more likely to respond (response rate=21%) than parents of children who are Native American (response rate=13%) and than parents of children who are Hispanic (response rate=11%). However, survey responses did not vary significantly by race/ethnicity, and a large enough number of Native American parents and Hispanic parents responded to ensure representativeness of results.

Results were weighted by district to take into account differential sampling and differences in response rates by district.

Explanation of progress or slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

As indicated in Display 8-2, the percentage of parents who reported that the school facilitated their involvement increased from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006. Districts reported to the WDE a more concerted effort to provide parents with information necessary to allow them to be effectively involved in the IEP process. The results of the survey completed last year were reported individually to each district in addition to an aggregate score included on the District Report Card. Some districts employ parent coordinators who greatly assist parents in becoming more involved in the IEP process for their child. Organizations such as the Parent Information Center and UPLIFT provide for parent advocates to attend IEP meetings with parents who request their assistance. All of these efforts appear to contribute to a positive trend in these data.

Display 8-2: Percent of Parents Who Report that the School Facilitated Their Involvement, Results Over Time

	FFY 2005	FFY 2006
Total number of Parent respondents	429	759
Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	223	445
Percentage who reported school facilitated their involvement	51.9%	58.6%

Response to OSEP Concerns:

In OSEP’s FFY 2005 Response table, OSEP indicated that that state did not display raw data for this indicator. As can be seen in Display 8-2, raw data for both FFY2005 and FFY2006 have been presented. OSEP also stated that the sampling plan was not approved. The sampling plan that was followed is given below.

- In April 2007, contact information (phones and addresses) for a representative sample of 3,739 students with disabilities who were on the December 2006 425 file. A total of 11,755 parents

were included on the December 2006 file. It was determined that a sample of approximately 3700 would give an appropriate margin of error and be practical in terms of resources.

- The sampling was done at the district level. A sample of students with disabilities was randomly selected from each of the 48 Wyoming districts. The number of students chosen was dependent on the number of total students with disabilities at a district as indicated in the table below. The sample sizes selected ensured roughly similar margins of error across the different district sizes.

Number of Students with Disabilities	Sample Size Chosen
1-70	All
71-100	70
101-150	80
151-200	90
201-1,000	100
1,001+	125

- For those districts for which a sample was chosen, the population was stratified by gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and grade level to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample.
- When calculating the state-level results, responses were weighted by the students with disability population size (e.g., a district that has four times the number of students with disabilities as another district will receive four times the weight in computing overall state results).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets Preschool settings (3-5 year olds)
2006 (2006-2007)	70.7% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that preschools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Display 8-3: Percent of Parents Who Report that the Preschool Facilitated Their Involvement

	FFY 2006
Total number of Parent respondents	972
Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	744
Percentage who reported school facilitated their involvement	76.5%

The target of 70.7% was met for the preschools.

In FFY 2006, local CDC staff distributed parent surveys in person at the conclusion of each IEP meeting. Surveys were distributed to parents whose child had been enrolled in the CDC for at least six months. CDC Directors ensured that parents were provided with a private space to complete the survey and with an envelope for them to seal their responses. A total of 972 surveys were returned. During FFY 2006, 2,188 children were enrolled in the Part B 619 program; thus, the estimated response rate is 44.4%. However, not all of these children were enrolled in the program for at least six months, so the response rate represents a conservative estimate of the actual response rate. The FFY 2006 response rate represents a significant improvement over the response rate achieved in FFY 2005 (18%).

To arrive at the percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement, a “percent of maximum” score based on the 20 items in Section A of the survey was calculated for each respondent. A respondent who rated the preschool a “5” (Strongly Agree) on each of the 20 items received a 100% score; a respondent who rated the preschool a “1” (Strongly Disagree) on each of the 20 items received a 0% score. A respondent who rated the preschool a “4” (Agree) on each of the 20 items received a 75% score. A parent who has a percent of maximum score of 80% or above was identified as one who reported that the school facilitated his/her involvement. An 80% cut-score represents a parent who is slightly more positive than “agree,” i.e., the parent has to have “strongly agreed” with at least one other item.

Reliability and Validity

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the race/ethnicity of the child; (3) by the age of the child; and (4) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 67% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children’s primary disability is a speech impairment, and 80% of special education students have a speech impairment; 13% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children’s primary disability is developmental disability, and 14% of special education students have a developmental disability. Furthermore, 81.7% of parent respondents indicated that their student is Caucasian, and 83.6% of special education students are Caucasian. Parents from each region responded to the survey, with response rates by region ranging from 14-98%.

Explanation of progress or slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

As indicated in Display 8-4, the percentage of parents who reported that the preschool facilitated their involvement increased from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006. In collaboration with the EIEP, the Child Development Centers utilized the data from the first year’s survey to ramp up their efforts to educate parents to the process concerning their child’s IEP. Center staff worked carefully and diligently to provide parents with information concerning Part B of the IDEA. The EIEP works in concert with the Parent Information Center to hold an annual conference for parents of preschool age children. The conference has been well received by parents from around the state.

Display 8-4: Percent of Parents Who Report that the Preschool Facilitated Their Involvement, Results Over Time

	FFY 2005	FFY 2006
Total number of Parent respondents	309	972
Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	217	744
Percentage who reported school facilitated their involvement	70.2%	76.5%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2006 for both Preschool and School:

The WDE in collaboration with the EIEP developed new model forms to be used by the CDCs and school districts as they strive to implement the requirements of IDEA 2004 and the Chapter 7 Rules. The model forms were developed to be parent friendly and a tool to increase understanding of the process from initial evaluation forward. The model forms may be viewed at <http://www.k12.wy.us/SE/forms.asp>.

Parent Focus Groups were conducted as a part of each on-site monitoring visit (Continuous Improvement-Focused Monitoring). WDE, the Parent Information Center, and the school districts collaborated to schedule a meeting time and place and send information out to all parents of children with disabilities in grades kindergarten through Grade 12+ regarding the Focus Group. Evening meetings were scheduled in order to accommodate work schedules. WDE staff members facilitated the meetings and staff members from the Parent Information Center were on hand to help answer questions that parents might have regarding their own children and to provide information regarding the IEP process, dispute resolution, etc. Valuable information was gathered during these sessions in terms of how parents view their involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children. Parents were asked to give input to questions based upon hypotheses developed by the monitoring team prior to the on-site visits (e.g., LRE, transition planning, ESY, etc.). The information from parents was then used to further inform the monitoring team's on-site activities if deemed appropriate. However information gleaned from these sessions was never used as the sole basis for a finding of noncompliance.

The file review that is conducted during the on-site monitoring visits covers the related requirements included in such things as the prior written notice, informed consent, and meaningful involvement in the IEP process (i.e., 34 CFR §300.300, 34 CFR §300.304, 34 CFR §300.305, 34 CFR §300.501, 34 CFR §300.320 through 34 CFR §300.304, etc.).

In addition to the Improvement Activities addresses in the following session, the WDE conducted additional activities aimed at increasing parents' capacity to be more positively involved in the improvement of their child's services and results:

- The WDE website provides parents access to a Spanish translation of the Procedural Safeguards for Students with Disabilities and WDE Special Education Model IEP forms.
- The Wyoming Deaf-Blind Project sponsored a conference for parents to assist them with dealing with the grief issues related to having a child with a disability.
- The SIG/SPDG provided a sub-grant to a new parent support group, *Hands & Voices*, that supported parents and families of students who are hard of hearing or deaf through a website and quarterly newsletters.
- The SIG/SPDG provided the majority of the funding for an annual parent conference held in spring 2007. Stipends were available to parents to encourage and enable their attendance. Training sessions included review of procedural safeguards, sessions on parents as effective advocates and participants in the IEP, and RTI and PBIS initiatives.
- Parent Liaisons/Coordinators were provided waivers (upon request) for registration fees for the Teton Institute held in 7/06.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Administer the survey to a statewide random sample of parents of children with disabilities.*

This activity was completed through a contract with Data Driven Enterprises (May 2007). This practice will continue next year. The WDE staff will work with Data Driven Enterprises to determine strategies for increasing the return rate from parents of school age children with disabilities.

At the end of the 2005-06 school year the WDE determined that in order to better align the analysis of this indicator with the state's general supervision responsibilities a change in the vendor and process used the previous year was needed. The WDE is currently contracting with Data Driven Enterprises for data collection and analysis of several components of our general

supervision activities including the parent survey. The full detail of our sampling plan can be found in Indicator #8 in Wyoming SPP.

Activity 3: *Provide statewide training on modified training on modified NCSEAM survey including follow up.*

The EIEP conducted trainings with staff in the CDCs in how to distribute the survey to parents of preschool children receiving services in their centers. The goal was to achieve consistency in how the surveys were distributed and the instructions that parents were given to fill out each survey. Follow up training will be conducted each spring in order to ensure the fidelity of the process from center to center.

Activity 6: *Increase collaboration with PIC to provide assistance and information to parents as a result of needs identified through the administration of the parent survey.*

The WDE entered into a contract with PIC during FFY 2006 in order to increase the Center’s capacity to reach out to parents of children with disabilities. Activities outlined in the contract include: 1) attending public hearings for Chapter 7 Rules; 2) Provide guidance and on-site training for parents regarding Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities; 3) revision of a parent handbook to IDEA 2004; 4) facilitating Parent Focus Groups for each on-site monitoring visit conducted by the WDE; 5) participate in profession development training for key elements of Continuous Improvement/Focused Monitoring System; 6) increase capacity of parent outreach.

Activity 7: *Annually review the survey results and add activities if systemic statewide parent issues are identified.*

Data Driven Enterprises provided a wealth of information regarding the data collected from the parent surveys for both the WDE and the EIEP. The areas of concern are addressed under the next sections along with corresponding activities that will be added to this Indicator in the SPP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

The WDE proposes to change the measurable and rigorous targets established for this indicator for School Districts only due to a calculation error in the analysis of the parent survey baseline data for the FFY 2005. Although Wyoming reported a satisfaction rate of 80.7%, the satisfaction rate was actually 51%. Therefore we have modified our targets using 51% as our baseline and then increasing the targets through 2011.

The proposed Measurable and Rigorous targets:

- FFY 2005 = 51.85%
- FFY 2006 = 52.15%
- FFY 2007 = 52.55%
- FFY 2008 = 53.55%
- FFY 2009 = 54.55%
- FFY 2010 = 56.55%

These new targets are reflected in the SPP for Indicator #8 for the School Districts.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:

Activity 8: *Provide survey feedback to each district and CDC.*

Generate and disseminate reports of parent satisfaction disaggregated by district before the end of the school year with information regarding resources for increasing parent involvement. Provide training/professional development to districts to assist them in understanding the survey and its implications with the dissemination of the reports.

Activity 9: *Promote parent response to the Annual Parent Survey.*

Determine methods for obtaining a higher response rate to the survey through the development of improved methods and incentives.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9- Percent districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Display 9-1: Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification

	Under-representation	Over-representation
Total # of LEAs	48	48
# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0	0
% of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0.0%	0.0%
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0	0
Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0.0%	0.0%

The target of 0% was met.

The Wyoming Department of Education collects this data through the state December 1 Child Count data collection report. The WDE calculates an Alternate Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. The WDE used the Alternate Risk Ratio as defined by OSEP/WESTAT for determining disproportionate representation because it is most relevant and meaningful for Wyoming's rural population.

Risk ratios are difficult to interpret when they are based on small numbers of students (either in the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group). When risk ratios are based on small numbers, minor variations in the number of students in either the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group can produce

dramatic changes in the size of the risk ratio. Thus, an Alternate Risk Ratio was determined only if there were 10 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data)

Disproportionate representation is defined as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above (over-representation) or .25 or below (under-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies, procedures and practices of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Display 9-2: Definition of Disproportionate Representation

<u>Level</u>	<u>Alternate Risk Ratio</u>
<u>Over-Representation</u>	<u>3.00 and up</u>
<u>Under-Representation</u>	<u>.25 and below</u>

In addition to the disproportionate representation level, the WDE also defines two other levels of risk ratios: Cautionary and Warning. The purpose of these levels is to inform LEAs of potential identification issues so that they may be proactive in correcting any identification issues. Display 9-3 defines these other two levels.

Display 9-3: Cut-Scores for Flagging the LEAs for Possible Inappropriate Identification

<u>Level</u>	<u>Alternate Risk Ratio</u>
<u>Over-Representation</u>	
<u>Disproportionate Representation</u>	<u>3.00 and up</u>
<u>Warning</u>	<u>2.50-2.99</u>
<u>Caution</u>	<u>2.00-2.49</u>
<u>Under-Representation</u>	<u>.25 and below</u>

Depending on the cut-score level, the WDE takes different follow-up activities with the LEA, which are described in the SPP.

Display 9-4 indicates the number of LEAs that were flagged at each level. Display 9-5 indicates results by LEA.

Display 9-4: Number of Flagged Risk Ratios by Level

	Over-representation
Total # of LEAs	48
# of LEAs with a “cautionary” flag	2
# of LEAs with a “warning” flag	1
# of LEAs with a “disproportionate” flag	0
# of unique LEAs flagged	3
% of LEAs receiving a flag	6.25%
Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0.0%

Display 9-5: Final Risk Ratios that Were Flagged, By LEA FFY2006

LEA	Racial / Ethnic Group	District Enrollment of SWD in Ethnic Group	District Enrollment of SWD not in Ethnic Group	Alternate Risk Ratio	Disproportionate Level
1	Black	10	446	2.67	Warning
2	Native American	10	386	2.15	Caution
3	Native American	75	198	2.12	Caution

- Two of 48 districts (4.2%) fell into the “Caution” level based on their FFY 2006 data. These two have been “flagged” in the State’s system. The WDE performed internal analyses and further drill down of these district data, including analyses of trend data.
- One of 48 districts (2.1%) fell into the “Warning” level. The district was required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities via the risk-based self-assessment component of monitoring system. The risk-based self-assessment gives the WDE the ability to query the data in multiple disability categories and racial/ethnic groups.
- Through this process, the WDE found no districts to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that were the result of inappropriate identification of students with disabilities.

Valid and Reliable Data

The WDE is assured of the validity and reliability of these data because it processes the December 1 Child Count data through various built-in edit checks plus the WDE verifies the data for accuracy through LEA assurances and signatures.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

As indicated in Display 9-4, WDE maintained their 0% rate. Thus, for two years, no LEAs have had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

Display 9-6: Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification

	FFY2005	FFY2006
Total # of LEAs	48	48
# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation – Over-representation	0	0
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification – Over-representation	0	0
Percent who had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification – Over-representation	0.0%	0.0%
# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation – Under-representation	0	0
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification – Under-representation	0	0
Percent who had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification – Under-representation	0.0%	0.0%

As indicated in Display 9-4, WDE maintained their 0% rate. Thus, for two years, no LEAs have had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

During the review of a district’s data prior to the on-site monitoring visit, data from the district are compared to the current state rate of identification of students with disabilities (race and ethnicity) in service categories. Significant variations from the state rate lead the team to explore the requirements set forth in 34 CFR § 300.304-306. A review of the district’s policies, procedures and practices related to the child find process are conducted while on site. The continuum of services for children who are at risk for academic failure and the interventions that are provided prior to a referral for an initial evaluation are considered by the monitoring teams during the on-site visits. Files of children who were evaluated and not found eligible are also reviewed during this process to gain a full understanding of the district’s policies, procedures and practices.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming’s SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 2: Define Disproportionate Representation

Disproportionate representation is defined as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above (over-representation) or .25 or below (under-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies, procedures and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Activity 4: Determine appropriate improvement activities

The WDE has added three improvement activities as a result of the analysis performed during FFY 2006.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

In OSEP's SPP/APR Response Table, OSEP indicated that the WDE did not define disproportionate representation. As indicated above, the WDE defines disproportionate representation as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.0 or above.

WDE revised the narrative in Indicator 9 because the use of the term "significant" created confusion between the two areas of disproportionality §300.646 and §300.600(d)(3). The term significant was removed from Indicator 9 and will be used exclusively in relationship to the requirement to set aside 15% of federal flow through dollars for Early Intervening Services if a district is determined to have significant disproportionality. The WDE will require any district which has a risk ratio of 3.5 or above to set aside 15% of their federal flow through dollars for Early Intervening Services as defined in §300.600(d)(3)

In addition, the WDE changed the minimum cut-score at which a district would be flagged for potential disproportionate representation from 1.50 to 2.00. The reason for this change is two-fold. First, this aligns Indicator 9 with the Indicator 10. Second, and more importantly, in analyzing those risk ratios flagged at a 1.5-1.99 level, WDE noted that many were flagged as a result of idiosyncrasies due to small student number and not due to any systemic identification issues within an LEA. Thus, the threshold of 1.50 resulted in a number of "false positives," prompting the WDE to revise its cut-score. A ratio of 2.0 and above eliminates the false positives and allows the necessary amount of resources to go to those LEAs who realistically might have policies, procedures and practices resulting in inappropriate identification.

The following Improvement Activity has been removed:**Activity 5:** *Provide training and technical assistance to LEAs on Early Intervening strategies*

This activity was removed for clarification. WDE will provide training and technical assistance to districts with designated as having significant disproportionality and must provide EIS according to 300.600.(d)(3), however is not a requirement for Indicator #9.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:**Activity 3:** *Establish rubric to evaluate whether or not disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.*

This activity was revised to better align with the language used for Indicator #9. WDE also added additional years this activity will be performed. The WDE believes it is important to review the evaluation rubric annually in case there are improvements or adjustments needed.

Activity 5: *Improve self assessment tool for districts to use when examining policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of children with disabilities.*

The WDE will compare current on line self assessment tool and revise the tool as appropriate. A review of other states' self assessment tools will be done. Additionally, NCCREST has several good technical assistance guides which provide valuable information in the type of information which can be gathered and reviewed as part of a self assessment process.

Activity 6: *Provide technical assistance to districts on developing appropriate district policies, procedures and practices.*

The WDE will provide Districts training and resources on developing LEA policies, procedures and practices.

Activity 7: *Participate on the for At-Risk Students*

Districts throughout Wyoming have various definitions of the at-risk resources which are available to students. This task force will provide guidance to districts in developing systems that address the at-risk continuum.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10- Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2006 (2006-2007)	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Display 10-1: Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification

	Under-representation	Over-representation
Total # of LEAs	48	48
# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	2	6
% of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	4.17%	12.50%
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0	0
Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0.0%	0.0%

The target of 0% was met.

The Wyoming Department of Education collects this data through the state December 1 data collection report. The WDE calculates an Alternate Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. The WDE uses the Alternate Risk Ratio as defined by OSEP/WESTAT for determining disproportionate representation because it is most relevant and meaningful for Wyoming's rural population.

Risk ratios are difficult to interpret when they are based on small numbers of students (either in the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group). When risk ratios are based on small numbers, minor variations in the number of students in either the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group can produce dramatic changes in the size of the risk ratio. Thus, an Alternate Risk Ratio was determined only if there were 10 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data).

Disproportionate representation is defined as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above (over-representation) or .25 or below (under-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Display 10-2: Definition of Disproportionate Representation

<u>Level</u>	<u>Alternate Risk Ratio</u>
<u>Over-Representation</u>	<u>3.00 and up</u>
<u>Under-Representation</u>	<u>.25 and below</u>

In addition to the disproportionate representation level, the WDE also defines two other levels of risk ratios: Cautionary and Warning. The purpose of these levels is to inform LEAs of potential identification issues so they may be proactive in correcting any identification issues. Display 10-3 defines these other two levels.

Display 10-3: Cut-Scores for Flagging the LEAs for Possible Inappropriate Identification

<u>Level</u>	<u>Alternate Risk Ratio</u>
<u>Over-Representation</u>	
<u>Disproportionate Representation</u>	<u>3.00 and up</u>
<u>Warning</u>	<u>2.50-2.99</u>
<u>Caution</u>	<u>2.00-2.49</u>
<u>Under-Representation</u>	<u>.25 and below</u>

Depending on the cut-score level, the WDE conducts different follow-up activities with the LEA. These activities are described in the SPP submitted December 2, 2005.

APR – Part B (4)

Wyoming

Display 10-4 indicates the number of LEAs that were flagged at each level. Display 10-5 indicates results by LEA.

Display 10-4: Number of Flagged Risk Ratios by Level

	Over-representation
Total # of LEAs	48
# of LEAs with a “cautionary” flag	10
# of LEAs with a “warning” flag	6
# of LEAs with a “disproportionate representation” flag (both over- and under-)	8
# of unique LEAs flagged	19
% of LEAs receiving a flag	39.58%
Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0.0%

Display 10-5: Alternate Risk Ratios that Were Flagged, By LEA FFY 2006

LEA	Racial / Ethnic Group	Disability	District Enrollment of SWD in Ethnic Group	District Enrollment of SWD not in Ethnic Group	Alternate Risk Ratio	Disproportionate Level
1	Hispanic	MD	11	13	4.62	Disproportionate
2	White	AT	16	0	4.39	Disproportionate
3	Native American	LD	11	39	3.99	Disproportionate
4	White	AT	18	0	3.67	Disproportionate
5	Hispanic	LD	51	117	3.65	Disproportionate
6	Native American	ED	15	49	3.46	Disproportionate
7	White	AT	11	2	2.91	Warning
8	Native American	LD	80	0	2.83	Warning
9	Hispanic	SL	10	76	2.72	Warning
10	White	HL	33	5	2.65	Warning
11	White	MD	11	1	2.63	Warning
12	Native American	LD	16	16	2.55	Warning
4	Hispanic	ED	12	68	2.41	Caution
13	White	HL	12	0	2.34	Caution
14	Hispanic	SL	16	46	2.30	Caution
15	White	AT	11	0	2.28	Caution
16	White	AT	10	1	2.19	Caution
17	Asian	SL	10	410	2.18	Caution
7	White	HL	74	7	2.17	Caution
17	White	AT	39	3	2.17	Caution
18	White	HH	20	0	2.09	Caution

19	Black	ED	13	150	2.09	Caution
6	White	ED	46	18	2.08	Caution
19	Hispanic	MD	23	61	2.06	Caution
18	White	AT	25	2	2.04	Caution
4	White	ED	67	13	2.03	Caution
18	White	ED	25	5	.24	Disproportionate
17	White	MD	16	2	.22	Disproportionate

- Ten of 48 districts (20.83%) fell into the “Caution” level based on their FFY 2006 data. These five have been “flagged” in the State’s system. The WDE performed internal analyses and further drill down of these district data, including analyses of trend data.
- Six of 48 districts (12.5%) fell into the “Warning” level. These districts have been required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities via the risk-based self-assessment component of monitoring system. The risk-based self-assessment gives the WDE the ability to query the data in multiple disability categories and racial/ethnic groups.
- Eight of 48 districts (16.7%) were placed in the “Disproportionate Representation” level. These districts were required to complete the risk-based self-assessment and participate in a file review with WDE Special Programs Unit staff.
- Through this process, the WDE found no districts to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification of students with disabilities.

Valid and Reliable Data

The WDE is assured of the validity and reliability of these data because it processes the December 1 child count data through various built-in edit checks. In addition the WDE verifies the data for accuracy through LEA assurances and signatures.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

As indicated in Display 10-4, the WDE maintained its 0% rate for Indicator 10. Thus, for two years, no LEAs have had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

During the review of a district’s data prior to an on-site monitoring visit, data from the district are compared to the current state rate of identification of students with disabilities in all disability categories. Significant variations from the state rate lead the team to explore the requirements set forth in 34 CFR § 300.304-306. The WDE monitoring team conducts a review of the district’s policies, procedures and practices related to the child find process. During these visits, the team reviews the continuum of services for children who are at risk for academic failure and the interventions provided prior to a referral for an initial evaluation. Files of children who were evaluated and not found eligible might also be reviewed during this process to gain a full understanding of the district’s policies, procedures and practices.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming’s SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 2: *Define Disproportionate Representation*

Disproportionate representation is defined as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above (over-representation) or .25 or below (under-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Activity 4: *Determine appropriate improvement activities*

The WDE has added three improvement activities as a result of the analysis performed during FFY 2006.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

In OSEP's SPP/APR Response Table, OSEP indicated that the WDE did not define disproportionate representation. As indicated above, the WDE defines disproportionate representation as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.0 or above.

WDE revised the narrative in Indicator 10 because the use of the term "significant" created confusion between the two areas of disproportionality in 34 CFR §§300.646 and 300.600(d)(3). The term significant was removed from Indicator 10 and will be used exclusively in relationship to the requirement to set aside 15% of federal flow through dollars for Early Intervening Services if a district is determined to have significant disproportionality. The WDE will require any district which has a risk ratio of 3.5 or above to set aside 15% of their federal flow through dollars for Early Intervening Services as defined in 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3)

The following Improvement Activity has been removed:**Activity 5:** *Provide training and technical assistance to LEAs on Early Intervening strategies*

This activity was removed for clarification. WDE will provide training and technical assistance to districts who are designated as having significant disproportionality and must provide EIS according to 300.600.(d)(3); however it is not a requirement for Indicator #10.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:**Activity 3:** *Establish rubric to evaluate whether or not disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.*

This activity was revised to better align with the language used for Indicator #10. WDE also added additional years this activity will be performed. The WDE believes it is important to review the evaluation rubric annually in case there are improvements or adjustments which need to be made.

Activity 5: *Improve self assessment tool for districts to use when examining policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of children with disabilities.*

The WDE will compare current on line self assessment tool and revise the tool as appropriate. Review of other states' self assessment tools will be done. Additionally, NCCREST has several good technical assistance guides which provide valuable information in the type of information which can be gathered and reviewed as part of a self assessment process.

Activity 6: *Provide technical assistance to districts on developing appropriate district policies, procedures and practices.*

The WDE will provide Districts needed training and resources on developing LEA policies, procedures and practices for the identification of children with disabilities.

Activity 7: *Participate on the for At-Risk Students*

Districts throughout Wyoming have various definitions of the at-risk resources which are available to students. This task force will provide guidance to districts in developing systems that address the at-risk continuum.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator #11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a, but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>100% of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006

Display 11-1: Percent of Children Evaluated within the 60-Day Timeline

	FFY 2006
a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	2,242
b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days	355
c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days	1,344

# not included in b. or c.	543
Percent who met the indicator	75.8%

The target of 100% was not met.

Display 11-2: Percent of Children Evaluated within the 60-Day Timeline (Preschool Part B Population)

Region	# Children for Whom Parental Consent to Evaluate was Received (a)	# Determined not Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 days (b)	# Determined Eligible who Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (c)	# Children whose Evaluations not Completed w/in 60 days	Percent = $[(b+c)/(a)] * 100$
6	85	20	61	4	95%
7	64	2	60	2	96%
10	91	13	78	0	100%
12	85	14	67	4	95%
13	47	7	40	0	100%
Total	372	56	306	10	97%

The target of 100% was not met.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, the WDE began requiring each district to report the number of evaluations conducted, the number of children found eligible for services, the number of children found not eligible for services, the number of days between receipt of parental consent and evaluation/eligibility determination and if necessary the reason evaluation/eligibility was not determined within the timeline.

The WDE accomplished this by incorporating these data elements into an existing special education data collection which is conducted at the completion of each school year. Based on the information provided by districts and public agencies, each entity is required to provide, as part of the WDE risk-based self-assessment portion of the Focused Monitoring system, an explanation of any evaluation not completed in the 60-day timeline.

During the review of the FFY 2005 data, the WDE identified 38 districts which had at least one student who was not evaluated within the 60-day timeline. Since 38 districts represent almost 80% of all school districts in Wyoming (38 of 48) WDE decided to evaluate the data collection procedures and processes to ensure data received was valid and reliable. The WDE discovered widespread confusion among districts in their understanding of data element definitions, which resulted in data being reported differently from district to district. The WDE took a systemic approach to correct misunderstanding and non-compliance during FFY 2006, and the state believes the improvement made on this indicator (74.5% to 86.5%) is evidenced that the extensive training and assistance provided to districts concerning this data collection was successful.

With the FFY 2006 data, the WDE again required districts to complete the WDE risk-based self-assessment portion of the Focused Monitoring system and provide explanations for any evaluation not completed within the 60-day timeline. If a district had not completed the evaluations in the appropriate timeframe and the reason for missing the deadline isn't for the two reasons set forth in 34 CFR §300.301(d)(1) & (2), the district is required to provide the WDE with a plan to correct the non-compliance within one year.

The 296 delayed evaluations were from 34 school districts; although four of these districts were above 95% so they will not be required to complete a corrective action plan. The remaining 30 LEAs will be required to write a corrective action plan to explain their process for determining eligibility. Of the 296 students who had evaluations not completed within the 60-day timeline, the length of their evaluation timeline ranged from 61 to 217 days. Reasons for these delays included scheduling conflicts, assessment delays, weather delays, and miscalculations of assessment results. 78 of the 296 (38%) had evaluation timelines of 61-65 days.

In its regional preschool centers, Wyoming gathers data for Indicator 11 through the self assessment, electronic file review, and on-site file review components of its monitoring system. Five of the regional preschool development centers are monitored every year, except every third year in which four regions are monitored. The data from regions monitored in FFY 2006 show a need for improvement in order for the state to meet its target of 100% compliance for this Indicator. The current preschool data collection system does not allow the state to determine the exact number of days exceeding the 60 day limit in each instance. For FFY 2007 the data collection process has been modified to capture this information. However the FFY 2006 data table (11-2) indicates Wyoming's developmental preschools continue to have over 95% compliance with the requirement reflected by Indicator 11.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Notify all districts of new data collection requirement for this indicator beginning 07/01/05.*

This activity has been successfully completed. FFY 2006 was the second year of this collection requirement. Districts received training on this data collection during the fall of 2004 and the fall of 2005. Updates and additional training are provided each year for data collections required by the WDE.

Activity 2: *Amend monitoring procedures to consider 60-day timelines for initial evaluations.*

During FFY 2006 the Continuous Improvement-Focused Monitoring system included a review of the related requirements for Indicator 11 through a comprehensive file review process and interviews of staff, administrators and parents conducted during on-site monitoring visits.

Activity 3: *Amend monitoring system to include the review of files for students found not eligible for special education and related services.*

During FFY 2006 the Continuous Improvement-Focused Monitoring system included a review of the assessment process conducted for students who were not found eligible for special education and related services. This was accomplished through a comprehensive file review process and interviews of staff, administrators and parents while conducting on-site monitoring visits.

Activity 6: *Provide Technical Assistance to districts to collect baseline, annual evaluation and outcome data as requested.*

The Special Programs Unit in coordination with the Data, Career and Technology Unit at WDE have created a data collection guidebook which provides all districts with clear definitions of data elements and guidance on the data collection process including a section of frequently asked questions.

Activity 7: *Implement focused monitoring process to review districts with areas of concerns:*

The data collected for Indicator 11 is used as an additional piece of data WDE uses during the data drill down process of WDE's Continuous Improvement-Focused Monitoring system. These data become part of hypothesis development in the area of compliance with the related requirement for Indicator 11.

Activity 8: *Add indicator to EIEP monitoring file review.*

This activity was completed during FFY 2006 and will continue to be a component of the monitoring system. File reviews are conducted during on-site monitoring visits of five regions during FFY 2006. This was accomplished through a comprehensive file review and interviews of staff and parents.

Activity 9: *Provide TA to CDCs to ensure knowledge of and compliance with IDEA 2004.*

The CDC staff members were included in all trainings conducted by the WDE regarding the implementation of the requirements of Part B of the IDEA and Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities. They were also involved in the creation of and training regarding the model IEP forms for the State.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE continues to analyze data and adjust improvement activities and timelines accordingly. As WDE/EIEP have examined data concerning evaluation timelines for the past two years and worked with districts and CDCs to improve evaluation practices and procedures, additions have been made to the Improvement Activities, reflecting necessary changes. Additional resources and activities have been added to the State Performance Plan for Indicator 11.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:**Activity 14:** *Assist districts and CDCs with the review and development of appropriate policies, procedures, and practices.*

The WDE and EIEP will provide districts and center staff with ongoing technical assistance in the area of evaluating current policies, procedures and practices in the area of child find, including initial evaluations conducted within the required 60-day timeline; if revision of existing policies, procedures, and practices is necessary, WDE/EIEP will provide guidance on improving practices and where necessary completing Corrective Action Plans.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100% of eligible children with IEP by 3rd birthday

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3, Who are Found Eligible for Part B, and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by their Third Birthdays					
Region Monitored	# of Children Referred by Part C (a)	Not Eligible for Part B (b)	Yes (c)	No	Parent Refusal Caused Delay (d)
6	27	5	21	1	0
7	46	11	30	3	2
10	20	8	11	1	0
12	94	26	57	8	3
13	31	3	24	2	2
Total	218	53	143	15	7
Calculation (Percent = c / a-b-d *100):					143/218-53-7=90.5%

Account for Children Referred from Part C and Found Eligible for Part B but did not Have an IEP in Place by their Third Birthday		
Region	Range of Days Beyond the Third Birthday	Reason for Delay
6	2 day	Parent no show, rescheduled
7	1 day	Parent asked to reschedule
7	1 day	Parent hard to contact
7	10 days	Parents contacted 3 x to schedule meeting
10	23 days	Delay in ability to test due to translation of assessments, English not primary language
12	32 days	Parent no show, rescheduled
12	7 days	Rescheduled per parent request
12	10 days	Parent no show, rescheduled
12	5 days	Rescheduled per parent request
12	54 days	Parent no show, out of town, rescheduled
12	1 day	Rescheduled per parent request
12	70 days	Parent no show, difficult to contact, rescheduled
12	58 days	Parent no show, repeated attempts to contact to reschedule
13	23	Parents cancelled twice
13	23	Parents cancelled twice

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Wyoming gathers data for Indicator 12 through the file review component of its monitoring of the 14 regional Child Development Centers. Five of the regions are monitored each year, except on every third year in which only 4 regions are monitored. Data from regions monitored in FFY 2006 show a continued need for improvement in order for the state to meet its target for this Indicator. Each of the five regions monitored during the FFY 2006 had at least one instance of non-compliance with this Indicator; one region had only one instance; two regions had two instances; one region had three instances; and one region had eight instances.

The Child Development Centers not meeting this requirement must address the non-compliance in their respective Corrective Action Plans and correct the findings within one year. The EIEP continues to work on revising the method used to collect this data. The revision would allow the EIEP to collect referral data from all Child Development Centers every year in order to report a more comprehensive picture of how the state is complying with 20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B). This process has not been completed due to the staff vacancies and turn over in the EIEP. The EIEP looks forward to reporting the progress of this project in the FFY 2007 APR.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Identify and review regions with late IEPs to determine trends and to identify necessary TA.*

Regions and individual Child Development Centers with late IEPs lacking adequate justification in the children's files were required to address the issue through formal Corrective Action Plans following the EIEP/WDE monitoring report. Necessary steps and activities are outlined in each plan, and EIEP/WDE will follow up with each region to ensure noncompliance is corrected within the one-year timeline.

Activity 2: *Develop training for regions to ensure adequate parental participation*

The EIEP continues to post parent handbooks on its website. Additionally the WDE SIG/SPDG provided the majority of the funding for an annual parent conference held in spring 2007. Stipends were available to parents to encourage and enable their attendance. This conference was for parents who have a child with disabilities ages 3-21. Training sessions included review of procedural safeguards, sessions on parents as effective advocates and participants in the IEP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

No revisions to the targets, improvement activities, timelines or resources will be made to this Indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Display 13-1: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets Indicator 13

	FFY 2006
# of youth whose IEPs were reviewed	938
# of youth whose IEPs met the indicator	586
Percent of youth whose IEPs met the indicator	62.51%

The target of 100% was not met.

Data on this indicator were collected through the self assessment portion of the WDE Continuous Improvement Focus Monitoring System; each LEA applied the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)'s Indicator 13 Checklist to student files. The NSTTAC Checklist was completed on a representative sample of 938 students from each of the 48 districts in the state. By collecting data from each of the districts in the state, the Special Programs Unit is assured that the data aggregated across the districts is representative of the state.

For each district, the WDE selected a stratified random sample of up to 25 students age 16 and above. The WDE stratified the population of students at each district by school, primary disability, gender, and race/ethnicity. If a district had 24 or fewer students age 16 and above, the WDE required the district to select all students. If a district had 25 or more students age 16 and above, the WDE created a random sample of 25 students. The WDE Special Programs Unit sent a list of WISER IDs (state-assigned unique identification number) to each district, and districts completed an online version of the NSTTAC Checklist on the chosen sample of students.

To obtain the overall state percentage of students who met this indicator, the WDE weighted the data to reflect each LEA's appropriate proportion of students age 16 and above in the state (i.e., given that some

LEAs completed the checklist on all their qualifying students and other LEAs collected data on only a proportion of their qualifying students (weighting was needed).

Reliability and Validity of Data Collected

The WDE provided training to all district staff involved in completing the NSTTAC checklist to ensure that the checklist was completed consistently and accurately across districts. In addition, beginning in FFY 2006, in districts selected for on-site monitoring visits, a representative from WDE applies the NSTTAC checklist data on a random sample of student files to verify self assessment reporting.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

As indicated in Display 13-2, the WDE experienced great progress on this indicator. In 2005-06, 50.8% of reviewed files met the indicator; in 2006-07, 62.5% met the indicator.

Display 13-2: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that meets Indicator 13 Results Over Time

	FFY 2005	FFY 2006
# of youth whose IEPs were reviewed	954	938
# of youth whose IEPs met the indicator	485	586
Percent of youth whose IEPs met the indicator	50.80%	62.51%

As can be seen in Display 13-3, significant progress was realized on five of the six checklist items. For example, the percentage of files that had a measurable postsecondary goal increased from 64.61% to 79.43%.

Display 13-3: Percent of IEPs who met a given requirement of the NSTTAC Checklist – Results Over Time

Requirement	FFY 2005		FFY 2006	
	Total # IEPs	% with Yes response	Total # IEPs	% with Yes response
1. Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?	954	64.61%	938	79.43%
2. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s)?	954	78.99%	938	91.30%
3. Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?	954	79.42%	938	88.81%
4. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent (or child once the age of majority is reached) consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?	954	60.24%	938	76.43%
5. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?	954	62.69%	938	78.66%

6. Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?	954	87.47%	938	91.45%
IEPs that meet all transition requirements for Indicator 13	954	50.80%	938	62.51%

Display 13-4: Percent of LEAs Who Corrected Noncompliance

	FFY 2005
# of LEAs out of compliance	41
# of LEAs who corrected noncompliance within one year	9
% of LEAs who corrected compliance within one year	22%

The WDE has made a concerted effort to improve outcomes for all students with disabilities in Wyoming and believe the fact that we are collecting compliance information for Indicator 13 from all districts annually demonstrates this commitment.

In FFY 2005 there were 41 districts which were out of compliance with Indicator 13; this meant 85% of LEAs in the state had areas of non-compliance regarding the requirements for transition plans. The WDE addressed this non-compliance as a systemic state wide area of non-compliance and created a compliance plan which was implemented throughout the state not just in the 41 districts which didn't meet the target. The plan included a variety of activities aimed at increasing the knowledge and practice of district personnel responsible for implementing transition activities. Specifically during the FFY 2006 new model forms were developed with the input from the State's Secondary Transition Council; the forms were carefully developed to be a vehicle for thoughtful transition planning to better address the individual needs of students 16 years and older. LEAs were provided individual training on the IEP transition form at the Annual Leadership Symposium held in the summer of 2007.

The number and percentage of LEAs that are now in compliance is indicated in Display 13-4. In FFY 2006 37 LEAs were identified as being out of compliance with requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b) and are these districts are currently addressing the non-compliance through a variety of activities. In addition, the focus of the WDE sponsored regional trainings in the spring of 2008 will provide districts with more in depth information about developing and implementing transition plans. The Second Annual Leadership Symposium will include a track aimed at providing further assistance to transition coordinators and teachers on best practices in implementing transition activities.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming's SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Provide technical assistance to LEA's regarding development of effective transition plans*

A WDE transition conference was held in August 2006 with a focus on implementing the new requirements in the IDEA regulations which took effect August 2006. In addition, the Secondary Transition Council and Wyoming Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) held a panel discussion concerning the post secondary services available during the statewide CEC conference held during the fall of 2006.

Based upon data regarding post school outcomes for low incidence populations (specifically Deaf/Hard of Hearing and Visually Impaired) the WDE placed a strong emphasis on transition and effective instructional strategies for teachers and service providers of these students. These programs included: 1) The Wyoming Deaf-Blind Project which provided trainings to address needs of students with visual impairments, hearing impairments, deafness, blindness and multiple disabilities; 2) Communication Matrix Assessment – how to determine current levels of communication ability and set future communication goals; 3) Every Move Counts: Sensory-

Based Strategies for Identifying Appropriate Technological Interventions for Individuals with Severe and Profound Differences; 4) Emergent to Transitional to Conventional Literacy: Moving Through the Beginning Literacy Framework – supporting literacy development for upper elementary, middle and secondary students with severe disabilities, and 5) Emergent Literacy for Students: A Project Based Approach – addressing literacy needs for older students through the application of project based learning.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE continues to analyze data and adjust improvement activities and timelines accordingly. WDE has examined data collected from the Indicator 13 Checklist for the past two years and worked with districts to improve transition planning for students with disabilities aged 16 and older. As a result additions and revisions have been made to the Improvement Activities, reflecting necessary changes. Additional resources and activities have been added to the State Performance Plan for Indicator #13. Cross Collaborative Teams (CCT) have been established across the WDE for the purpose of examining technical assistance and improvement activities regarding graduation and dropout rates for all students, including students with disabilities. It is a critical component of the WDE Strategic Plan and that of the State Board of Education and ties into the Governor's Wyoming Education Quality of Life Result/Goal #5: *Students are successfully educated and prepared for life's opportunities.*

The following Improvement Activity has been removed:

Activity 5: *Require a CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP) for any district found out of compliance for transition requirements to meet compliance within one year.*

This activity was removed because it is already a requirement under IDEA rule and regulation.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:

Activity 4: *Provide targeted technical assistance to LEAs*

Develop targeted technical assistance to ensure correction of identified transition noncompliance.

Activity 6: *Evaluate the efficacy of the Indicator 13 Checklist.*

This activity was added to determine whether or not the current tool is still appropriate or whether there is a different tool which would allow us to better evaluate the exact area causing district non-compliance and enable WDE to provide more specific technical assistance.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
 Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:
 a. # of findings of noncompliance.
 b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
 Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.
 For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100% of noncompliance corrected within one year

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

	FFY 2006-2007
A. Monitoring findings related to priority areas for school districts closed within 1 year	66.67%* (n=12/18)
B. Monitoring findings related to priority areas for preschools closed within 1 year	100%* (n=6/6)

*Target was met for the preschools, but not for the school districts.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The WDE monitored seven districts and assisted in the monitoring visits for five Child Development Centers between December 2005 and July 2006. Of the seven districts monitored all seven had at least one area of non-compliance. Two districts had one area of non-compliance; two districts had two areas of non-compliance; two districts had three areas of non-compliance; and one district had five areas of non-compliance. Of the five CDCs that were monitored, all five had at least one are of noncompliance. Each district or region was required to complete and implement a corrective action plan, which was reviewed and approved by the WDE monitoring staff.

During the past year, the WDE monitoring team conducted follow-up visits, and all seven districts cleared a substantial amount of the existing non-compliance. Each of the regional CDCs corrected all areas of non-compliance. However in three of the school districts, six areas of non-compliance still exist.

Sometimes districts are unable to fully correct findings of noncompliance within one year. Generally this takes place when the district is responding to systemic findings of noncompliance made by WDE. In these situations, WDE had approved a corrective action plan that was judged by WDE to be reasonably calculated to achieve its goals of compliance, and the district had implemented the CAP. However, WDE does not simply accept an implemented CAP as evidence that systemic noncompliance has been corrected; it sends a team to the district to engage in a fresh on-site monitoring activity to determine the current compliance status of the issue. During the follow-up monitoring visit a sample of student files, different from the original sample is reviewed. This is because the compliance status of the original sample will not enable the WDE to determine whether a systemic problem (one that by definition affects more than the original group of students) has been resolved.

If the follow up monitoring determines that noncompliance has not been fully corrected, the WDE requires the district then agree to and implement a compliance agreement. The agreement is preceded by a meeting between the State Director of Special Education and the district's Superintendent, Board of Trustees Chairperson and District Special Education Director wherein the potential enforcement consequences of continued noncompliance and strict timelines are made clear to the local officials.

WDE provides intensive technical assistance to the LEA in the development of the compliance agreement to ensure that it has the scope and depth necessary to correct the systemic findings of noncompliance within a relatively short timeframe. In addition, WDE frequently provides intensive, targeted, sometimes mandatory, technical assistance through its own staff or through contracts with outside experts in the implementation of the compliance agreement to ensure that compliance is achieved. The 2009 APR will include the compliance results of current compliance agreements. WDE currently has compliance agreements in place in three districts that had findings resulting from 2005-2006 monitoring visits.

Display 15-1 on page 64 summarizes the findings of noncompliance made by WDE during FFY 2005. Seven unique districts were monitored and the WDE made 18 findings of non-compliance in those districts. Each finding is directly linked to a specific SPP Indicator and Monitoring Priority Area. As indicated by column five, 12 of 18 findings were corrected within the one year timeline. For six findings however, the effected districts were not able to fix clear the findings within one year. The WDE has implemented a compliance agreement with these districts in accordance with the process described above.

APR – Part B (4)

Wyoming

Display 15-1

District ID #	Findings	Indicator #	Monitoring Priority Area	Corrected Within One Year	Action if Not Corrected	Activity
1	Timelines	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
5	Measurable IEP Goals	3	FAPE	N	Compliance Agreement	On-site
6	Accommodations	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
7	Classroom Based Assessments	3	FAPE	N	Compliance Agreement	On-site
2	ESY	3	FAPE	N	Compliance Agreement	On-site
2	Transfers	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
3	Timelines	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
3	Classroom Based Assessment	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
4	Timelines	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
4	Related Services	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
5	Evaluation Content	3	FAPE	N	Compliance Agreement	On-site
7	Assessment Accommodation Documentation	3	FAPE	Y	N/A	On-site
7	LRE documentation	5	FAPE	N	Compliance Agreement	On-site
2	Timelines	11	Child Find	Y	N/A	On-site
5	Eligibility Determination	11	Child Find	N	Compliance Agreement	On-site
8	Request for evaluation	11	Child Find	Y	N/A	Dues Process Hearing
2	Transition	13	Transition	Y	N/A	On-site
2	Data Accuracy	20	General	Y	N/A	On-site

In anticipation of reporting FFY 2007 general supervision data, the WDE is providing a description of how its current general supervision system connects compliance with program requirements to improve outcomes and educational results for students with disabilities.

General Supervision: Connections Between Compliance with Program Requirements and Student Outcomes/Results

The monitoring component of the WDE’s system of general supervision contains four components: 1) Stable Self-Assessment, 2) Risk-Based Self-Assessment. 3) On-Site Focused Monitoring and 4) On-Site Random Monitoring. Student-level educational results and data guide the activities conducted in each of the four components listed above, ensuring that compliance with requirements related to student outcomes are monitored in a thorough, substantive manner.

In addition, compliance with program requirements which are not as closely related to student outcomes is also addressed through these four components of the state’s monitoring system. The table below sets forth the relation among the four components, the SPP indicators, program requirements related to the indicators, and other program requirements not directly related to the SPP Indicators.

Monitoring System Component	SPP Indicator	Compliance with Program Requirements Related to SPP Indicators	Compliance with Program Requirements not Directly Related to SPP Indicators
Stable Self-Assessment (All Districts Complete)	4	ascertain data accuracy	districts self-monitor compliance with select requirements through a comprehensive file review checklist
	5c	justify restrictive placements	
	13	apply NSTTAC checklist	
	20	ascertain data accuracy	
Risk-Based Self-Assessment (Districts Complete Based on Data)	3a	districts specify steps to meet AYP targets	Not Applicable
	3b	districts with less than 95% participation explain why	
	9	districts set forth policies and procedures for review	
	10		
	11	districts explain each reason for missing the timeline requirement for each student affected	
On-Site Focused Monitoring (Districts Selected Based on Data via Results of the Weighted Formula)	1	compliance with requirements related to these indicators monitored on-site by WDE in every district selected	WDE applies a comprehensive file review checklist to a sample of student files
	2		
	3c		
	5a		
	5b		
	9	on-site review in districts at “Significant” level	
	10		
13	WDE applies NSTTAC checklist		
On-Site Random Monitoring (Random Selection)	same as on-site focused monitoring		

Selection of Districts for On-Site Focused Monitoring

In order to facilitate the selection of districts for on-site monitoring visits, all of Wyoming’s 48 school districts were divided into three population groups. The WDE, with the assistance of the Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Group, created a weighted formula which was used to rank districts according to their performance on a select group of SPP Indicators. For the districts monitored during FFY 2006, the table below shows the Indicators used in the WDE’s weighted formula and the weight given to each.

SPP Indicator for District Selection	Weight
1	18.75%
2	18.75%
3c	18.75%
3c	18.75%
5a	12.5%
5b	12.5%

Furthermore, in districts selected for on-site monitoring visits by the WDE, SPP Indicator data are used to 1) develop compliance hypotheses for further investigation through on-site activities, and 2) create purposeful samples to focus and guide the on-site activities. The following table shows the extent to which SPP data were used in crafting both hypotheses and purposeful samples during the 2006 – 2007 school year.

SPP Indicator	Number of Times Indicator Data Used in Developing Compliance Hypotheses	Number of Times Indicator Data Used in Formulating Purposeful Samples for On-Site Investigation
1	7	0
2	7	0
3c	8	11
4	0	2
5a, 5b, 5c	6	9
9, 10	1	1

Results of Continuous Improvement-Focused Monitoring in FFY 2006

During FFY 2006, WDE was able to validate its compliance hypotheses in 16 of 21 cases. In other words, the state’s hypotheses were substantiated 75% of the time. The substantiation of these hypotheses resulted in substantive findings in each case, and the respective districts are currently implementing Corrective Action Plans to correct these findings. The final table below illustrates the types of substantive, systemic findings made by the WDE during the 2006 – 2007 school year.

IDEA Program Requirement Area	Number of Systemic Findings of Noncompliance
FAPE	6
FAPE – Extended School Year	4
LRE	5
Child Find	1
Transition	6

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

WDE and the EIEP were able to conduct all of the Improvement Activities outlined in the SPP for Indicator 15. District and preschool staff have gained a much greater understanding of the State’s responsibility for General Supervision. We have had the opportunity to watch second order change at it finest!

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming’s SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 2: *Provide technical assistance to districts regarding new resolution session requirement*

The WDE developed new forms to facilitate the implementation of this new requirement. These new forms were disseminated at the WASEA fall conference. In addition the WDE has posted the new forms on its website.

Activity 3: *Provide annual training for the WDE hearing and mediation officers*

The WDE provided a fall and spring training session to update all Wyoming hearing and mediation officers on changes and revisions to federal and state rules and regulations.

Activity 4: *Review monitoring process and make necessary adjustments; explore possibility of web-based monitoring component*

During FFY 2006 WDE completed the pilot phase of its newly developed focused monitoring system. A review of the process and its various components, with stakeholder group input resulted in slight modifications which were implemented for FFY 2007. The WDE continues to work with a third party contractor to identify the possibility of developing a web based data integration system which would enable WDE to collect IEP data elements directly from district IEP systems.

Activity 5: *Develop internal system to track and respond to informal complaints from LEAS, parents and stakeholders*

A WDE consultant has developed and maintains a database to record and track all customer contacts including informal comments or complaints. All contacts are directed to appropriate WDE staff for follow up.

The following Improvement Activities have been removed**Activity 11:** *Implement corrective action tracker*

The WDE and EIEP chose to remove this item, since Activity 7 appears to represent a similar activity.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006 – 2007)	100% of complaints resolved within 60-day timeline

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

School Year	Complaints (number)	Complaints Withdrawn (number)	Complaints Extended for Exceptional Circumstances	Complaints Resolved within 60-day timeline (number)	Percent of Complaints with Reports Issued that were Resolved within 60-day Timeline (percent)
2006-2007	5	2	0	3	100%

A total of five complaints were received in the WDE office, yet two of those complaints were withdrawn before an investigation commenced. None of the complaint timelines were extended. All complaint investigations were completed and reports issued within the 60-day timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Although the number of complaints in Wyoming is very small, the WDE noted an increased number of formal complaints during FFY 2006. WDE reviews common patterns and themes that may emerge in complaint investigations and offers technical assistance to school districts as necessary changes are addressed through Corrective Action Plans. The state believes a variety of factors have affected the number of complaints received by the WDE office including heightened accountability for the outcomes of students with disabilities paired and a growing knowledge base among parents of how their children are progressing through the system.

In the event that the total number of complaints reaches the minimum number of 10 in the State, the WDE and the EIEP look forward to developing and discussing improvement activities, progress and slippage.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

Revisions were made to refine the State Complaint Procedures during FFY 2006 as the result of the promulgation of state rules for Part B of the IDEA (July 14, 2007). These changes are reflected in the revised SPP submitted February 1, 2008. In addition, Wyoming's Dispute Resolution Process can be found at www.k12.wy.us.

State Complaint Procedures

The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) is responsible for investigating complaints and issuing a written decision within 60 days of receipt of the complaint. The complaint must be in writing and signed. It must allege a violation of Wyoming 2007 Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities, and/or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Action (IDEA). The violation alleged must have occurred not more than one year prior to the date that the complaint is received. The complaint also must set out sufficient facts to permit the Wyoming Department of Education to initiate an investigation of the allegation. If the complaint allegation involves a specific child, the complaint must include the name of the child, the child's address, the name of the school where the child attends, a description of the nature of the problem of the child, including related facts, and a proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available at the time the complaint is filed. A parent or other person filing a complaint may either use the form provided by WDE or provide a letter that contains the above information; the forms and explanation are available on the WDE website.

Acknowledgement of Complaint:

When a letter stating a potential complaint is received, the letter is forwarded immediately to the complaint coordinator. If the complaint is deemed sufficient, the complaint coordinator prepares an acknowledgement letter to the complainant and the agency administrator that includes the date WDE received the complaint, who filed the complaint, and the issues to be investigated. The acknowledgment letter informs the school district or public agency staff that WDE will contact the school district or public agency, requests the school district or public agency review the matter to determine actions the school district or public agency may take to resolve the issues, and requests that the child(ren)'s relevant special education records be forwarded to WDE by a specified date, generally within 10 calendar days. The school district or public agency is offered the opportunity, at its discretion, to propose a resolution of the complaint. The acknowledgment letter also informs the parties of the opportunity to voluntarily resolve the issues through mediation per 34 CFR §300.506 and 2007 Wyoming Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities, Part 2, Section 6. The complaint coordinator contacts the special education director regarding the complaint and identifies who will investigate the complaint. If the complainant is not the child's parent, the complaint coordinator will request the parent's written permission to release personally identifiable information to the complainant.

EIEP Complaint Procedure

Currently the mechanism that the EIEP uses for handling complaints is addressed through the MOU between the DDD and the WDE. The MOU indicates that all written complaints are forwarded to and investigated by the WDE.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006 – 2007)	100% of adjudicated due process hearings meet 45-day timeline

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

School Year	Hearing Requests (number)	Hearings Held/Fully Adjudicated (number)	Decisions Issued Within Timeline (number)	Hearing Requests Fully Adjudicated within Timeline (percent)
2006-2007	8	2	2	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Of the eight due process hearing requests held during the 2006-2007 school year, two resulted in legally binding agreements in resolution sessions; one was resolved through mediation; two due process requests were withdrawn and refiled as complaints; one due process request was filed and withdrawn by a parent’s attorney; one request was withdrawn when parties informally agreed to work out disagreements in the IEP process. One request was fully adjudicated and the hearing officer issued a decision within the timeline.

In the event that the State’s total number of due process hearing requests reaches the minimum of 10, the WDE and the EIEP look forward to developing and discussing improvement activities, progress and/or slippage.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

Revisions were made to refine the State’s Due Process Procedures during FFY 2006 as the result of the promulgation of state rules for Part B of the IDEA (July 14, 2007). These changes are reflected in the SPP. Wyoming’s Dispute Resolution Process is described in detail at www.k12.wy.us.

Due Process Procedures

Either the parent, adult student or the school district or public agency has the right to request a due process hearing. The due process hearing is filed under Wyoming 2007 Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). An alternative dispute resolution option in Wyoming is mediation.

Requesting Due Process

A hearing is requested by sending a letter or completed form (retrievable on the WDE website) to the school district or public agency and the Wyoming Department of Education. The request must include the name and address of the child, the name of the school where the child is attending, a description of the nature of the problem of the child relating to the due process hearing request, including the facts relating to such problem, and a proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the parents at the time. When a due process hearing is requested, WDE appoints an impartial hearing officer to conduct the hearing and sends the parent a notice of the procedural safeguards and a list of free or low-cost legal services available in the state.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General supervision Part B/ General Supervision

Indicator #18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006 – 2007)	100% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Resolution Session Hearing Requests

School Year	Resolution Session Hearing Requests (number)	Resolution Sessions Hearing Held / Fully Adjudicated (number)	Resolution Session Settlement Agreements Reached Within Timeline (number)	Resolution Session Settlement Agreements Fully Adjudicated within Timeline (percent)
2006-2007	2	2	2	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

WDE had two hearing requests and both were adjudicated within timelines. In the event the State's total number of due process hearing requests reaches the minimum of 10, the WDE and the EIEP look forward to developing and discussing improvement activities, progress and/or slippage.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

Revisions were made to refine the State's Due Process Procedures during FFY 2006 as the result of the promulgation of state rules for Part B of the IDEA (July 14, 2007). These changes are reflected in the SPP. Wyoming's Dispute Resolution Process is described in detail at www.k12.wy.us.

Resolution Session

Within 15 days of receiving notice of the parents' due process hearing request, the school district or public agency must schedule a resolution session with the parents and relevant members of the IEP team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the due process hearing request. A school district or public agency representative who has decision making authority for the district must participate in the resolution session. The school district or public agency may not have an attorney at the resolution session unless the parent is accompanied by an attorney. The resolution session process must be used unless the parents and school district or public agency agree in writing to waive the resolution session or agree to use the mediation process. When the school district or public agency and the parents resolve the request for due process hearing during a resolution session, they must execute a legally binding agreement that is signed by both the parent and the representative of the school district or public agency who has the authority to bind the agency. If the parties execute a legally binding agreement either party may void the agreement within three business days from the date on which the parties signed the agreement. If the parties agree to use the mediation process WDE has provides a form for parties to voluntarily request mediation.

If the school district or public agency has not resolved the request for the due process hearing to the satisfaction of the parents within 30 days of the receipt of the parents' due process hearing request, the due process hearing may proceed and all of the applicable timelines for a due process hearing begin. Except where the hearing relates to certain discipline requirements (34CFR§500.533), the hearing officer must issue a written decision based solely upon the evidence presented at the hearing within 45 days of completion of the resolution session or waiving of the resolution session. The WDE pays for the hearing officer, court reporter and facility charge. The WDE does not pay the school district or public agency's attorney fees or other school district or public agency's costs associated with the due process hearing.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006 – 2007)	100% of mediations result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

School Year	Mediations (number)	Mediation requests withdrawn (number)	Mediation agreements (number)	Percent of Mediations held resulting in mediation agreements within timelines (percent)
2006-2007	2	0	2	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The two mediation agreement requests resulted in mediation agreements and met all timeline requirements. In the event that the State’s total number of mediation requests reaches the minimum of 10, the WDE and the EIEP look forward to developing and discussing improvement activities, progress and/or slippage.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

Revisions were made to refine the State’s Due Process Procedures during FFY 2006 as the result of the promulgation of state rules for Part B of the IDEA (July 14, 2007). These changes are reflected in the SPP. Wyoming’s Dispute Resolution Process is described in detail at www.k12.wy.us.

Mediation Procedures

Each School district or public agency must ensure that procedures are established and implemented to allow parties to resolve disputes involving any matter under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) to engage in mediation per 34 CFR§ 300.506 or Wyoming Chapter 7, Part 2, Section 6.

A school district, public agency, parent or both may initiate a request for mediation services. A request for mediation services will be accepted by telephone or fax to the WDE but the request must be confirmed in writing and must include a brief description of the dispute and identify both parties. WDE provides and explanation of mediation procedures and a form to request mediation on its website. The WDE is available to the parties to encourage the use, and explain the benefits of the mediation process.

The WDE maintains a list of qualified mediators who are trained in effective mediation techniques and who are knowledgeable in laws and regulations relating to special education and related services. The parties may jointly recommend a mediator to the WDE; however consistent with §34 CFR 300.506, the selection of the mediator is at the discretion of the WDE. The mediator will receive a copy of the request for mediation. WDE bears the cost of the mediation, including the cost of the mediator. Each session in the mediation process will be scheduled in a timely manner and held in a location convenient to the parties. If the parties resolve a dispute through the mediation process, the parties must execute a legally binding agreement that sets forth the resolution and states that the discussions which occurred during the mediation process are confidential and may not be used as evidence in any subsequent due process hearing or civil proceedings. The mediation agreement is signed by both parties and is enforceable in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States.

Unless both parties agree otherwise, mediation shall begin within 21 days after the mediator is appointed and shall not delay hearings or appeals related to the dispute. The mediator will contact the parties to arrange the mediation session. Mediation session will be conducted at a neutral site and at a day and time convenient to all parties. The mediator will require the parties to sign an agreement to mediate which contains a confidentiality provision. If the parties resolve the dispute or a portion of the dispute, or agree to use another procedure to resolve the dispute, the mediator shall ensure that the agreement is in writing, signed by the parties, and that a copy of the agreement is given to each party. The agreement is legally binding upon the parties.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
 State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006 – 2007)	<p>A. 100% of State reported data are submitted on or before due dates</p> <p>B. 100% of State reported data submitted are accurate</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

Display 20-1: Percent of 618 Data and APR Data submitted on time and accurately

A. APR Grand Total	63
1. Timeliness (Timely Submission points)	5
2. Accuracy (Subtotal points)	58
B. 618 Grand Total	48
1. Timeliness (Timely Subtotal*2)	6
2. Accuracy ((B. + C. + D. Subtotals)*2)	42
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B)	111
D. Subtotal (C/119)	1.000
a. Overall Timeliness Score (A1+B1/19)	93.3%%
b. Overall Accuracy Score (A2+B2/100)	100.0%
E. Overall Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100)	93.3%

The target of 100.0% was not met.

APR – Part B (4)

Wyoming

SPP/APR Data Indicator 20 Rubric Score: 93.3%

Three out of seven 618 date Reports required by OSEP were completed and submitted on time. Assessment was submitted on February 1, 2007; Child Count and Environment were not submitted until June; EXIT, and Personnel reports were submitted by November 1, 2007; and Discipline was submitted on November 20, 2007. The Annual Performance Plan was submitted on time and modifications and suggestions for improvements and additional data required by OSEP were done on time as per instructions. Displays 20-2 and 20-3 provide details of the timeliness and accuracy calculations.

Display 20-2: Detailed Information on the Timeliness and Accuracy of APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Followed Instructions	Total
1	1		1	2
2	1		1	2
3A	1	1	1	3
3B	1	1	1	3
3C	1	1	1	3
4A	1	1	1	3
5	1	1	1	3
7	1	1	1	3
8	1	1	1	3
9	1	1	1	3
10	1	1	1	3
11	1	1	1	3
12	1	1	1	3
13	1	1	1	3
14	1	1	1	3
15	1	1	1	3
16	1	1	1	3
17	1	1	1	3
18	1	1	1	3
19	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	58
APR Score Calculation		Timely Submission Points - If the FFY2006 APR was submitted on-time, assign 5 points.		5
		Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		63
		Percent Timely Score (Timely Submissiong/5)		100.0%
		Percent Accurate Score (Subtotal/58)		100.0%
		Percent Score for SPP/APR data (Grand Total/63)		100.0%

Display 20-3: Detailed Information on the Timeliness and Accuracy of 618 Data

Table	A. Timely	B. Complete Data	C. Passed Edit Check	D. Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/07	0	1	1	1	3
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/07	0	1	1	1	3
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/07	0	1	1	1	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
SUBTOTAL	4	7	7	7	25
618 Score Calculation	Grand Total (Subtotal X 2) =				50
	Percent Timely Score (A. Timely Subtotal/7)				93.3%
	Percent Accurate Score(B. + C. + D. Subtotals/21)				100.0%
	Percent Score for 618 data (Grand Total/56)				93.3%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

During the 2006-07 school year, the WDE had significant staffing issues, including vacant positions for a substantial part of the year, within the Technology, Data and Career unit. This unit is responsible for the administration of data collection. The vacancies directly impacted the state’s ability to collect, analyze and scrub data as it came in from the districts; as a result some of the reporting deadlines were missed. The vacancies have since been filled and the data collection process continues to be refined which will enable timely reporting and analysis of future data. The WDE understands the significance of timely and accurate data and will continue to keep the emphasis on improving internal and external data processes.

At the same time, the WDE is very fortunate to have a sophisticated student reporting data system which is in its fourth year of implementation. The WISE (Wyoming Integrated Statewide Data System) is

focused on establishing a system for sharing and reporting data that is stored at the local districts on their internal software packages. Using the national data standards with Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) ensures compatibility, consistency and comparability of the data statewide without mandating specific software applications for districts and schools. SIF permits the districts and schools to select the “best of breed” software packages to support their data requirements. When WISE is fully implemented, the system will be able to access the data from these various systems for reporting to the Wyoming Department of Education and to Federal agencies much more efficiently through a concept known as vertical reporting.

The vertical reporting portion of the WISE project addresses several areas of interest of the National Forum on Education Statistics and Center for Education Statistics (NCES). It coordinates the data flow through electronic transfer; it reduces the burden on the data providers and improves both the quality and timeliness of the reporting mechanism. Disparate and proprietary data sources can co-exist and share information. This sharing of data offloads the burden from district and school staff for re-entry of data into separate software systems onto the vendors and their software applications. Since the data is initially captured close to the source where the quality is the highest, there is a reduced need for edit reviews and data quality checking making the data attainable sooner. More detailed data is available for analysis. WISE will continue to be instrumental in saving the districts numerous hours that have been required for district, school, state and federal reporting. A Wyoming Integrated Statewide Education Data System with timely and accurate data about each student will improve the quality of education for every student in Wyoming.

Below is a discussion of key Improvement Activities conducted during the FFY 2006 which are believed to have had a positive impact on Wyoming’s SPP for this Indicator:

Activity 1: *Implement reward/sanction program to encourage the LEAs to report data according to the WDE timeline.*

Included in the WDE Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Systems is a string of incentives and sanctions. Since the monitoring system is data driven, accurate data is critical.

Activity 2: *Provide technical assistance to LEA staff to submit data to the WDE*

Through the collaborative efforts of the Special Programs Unit and Career, Data, Technology Unit, data collection guidebooks have been developed for all data collections administered by the WDE. Prior to any data collection, a statewide WEN video training is available to district staff. These trainings allow districts to ask questions and provide an opportunity for WDE staff to offer detailed explanations about data elements and business rules.

Activity 7: *Participate in the EdFacts initiative to convert all 618 reporting to the EDEN system*

Wyoming is working diligently to gain 100% congruency between the DANS and EDEN reported data. The WDE participates in national meetings to gain further knowledge of EdFacts and the consolidation of data reporting systems. Within in the WDE, the Career, Data and Technology Unit continues to work collaboratively with the Special Programs Unit to understand data definitions, timelines and responsibilities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources

In order to give the WDE more time to analyze the quality of district data, the WDE is exploring the possibility of modifying collection windows. In addition WDE is beginning discussions with a third party contractor to evaluate the possibility of developing a data integration system which would streamline district reporting for monitoring purposes.

The following Improvement Activities have either been added as a new activity or a revision to an existing Improvement Activity:

Activity 10: *Explore changing collection window for the fall district data collection.*

This activity was added in order for WDE to explore the possibilities of moving the fall collection window earlier (Dec to Oct) which will enable us to have more time to clean and verify the accuracy of data.

Activity 11: *Develop a data integration pipeline specifically for electronic IEP systems*

This activity was added in an effort to continue to improve the quality of data collected and utilized by the WDE and to reduce data entry burden on LEAs. The WDE is contracting with a third party to explore and begin the development of a data integration system. The system will give WDE the ability to define common data elements which can be mined from several different LEA systems. This will reduce redundancy in data entry and improve data accuracy. The system will enable WDE to increase its confidence in the data gathered from LEAs.

Attachments

Attachment 1 - Table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 1 OF 18
 OMB NO. 1820-0659
 FORM EXPIRES: 09/30/2007

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	1074	6390
4	962	6256
5	946	6324
6	879	6159
7	910	6527
8	884	6660
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:) 11	631	6062

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B) ¹	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	1001	432		0
4	892	445		0
5	869	451		0
6	799	426		0
7	833	307		0
8	812	393		0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	558	259		0

¹ This column is gray because it does not apply to the math assessment. Do not enter data in this column.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment, students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment assessment without these changes.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB CAP ¹ (4C)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4D)
3	53	0	53	7	0
4	58	0	58	4	0
5	68	0	68	2	0
6	65	0	65	6	0
7	57	0	57	1	0
8	46	0	46	8	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	43	0	43	4	0

¹ NCLB 1% cap is the limit on the number of **scores on an alternate assessment on alternate achievement standards that can be counted as proficient** AYP calculations. If in 2006-07 your state had an approved exception to the 1% cap as indicated in Section A, use your 2006-07 adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be counted in the lowest achievement level.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) **or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.**

CURRENT DATE:

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE AN ASSESSMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (5)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
		PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	0	19	1
4	0	0	8	4
5	0	0	6	3
6	0	0	12	3
7	0	0	20	0
8	0	0	25	1
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	0	29	1

¹ In a separate listing, report the number of students exempted for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						9A ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3	PAWS	39	173	589	200	0	0	0	0	0	1001
4	PAWS	120	183	483	106	0	0	0	0	0	892
5	PAWS	185	265	386	33	0	0	0	0	0	869
6	PAWS	196	234	340	29	0	0	0	0	0	799
7	PAWS	287	284	246	16	0	0	0	0	0	833
8	PAWS	464	168	165	15	0	0	0	0	0	812
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAWS	212	267	76	3	0	0	0	0	0	558

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: 3

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3B and 3C.

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 09/30/2007

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	9B ROW TOTAL ¹
3	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is equal to the number reported in Column 4A minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against grade level achievement standards.

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						9C ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3	PAWS ALT	4	10	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	53
4	PAWS ALT	6	21	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	58
5	PAWS ALT	4	16	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	68
6	PAWS ALT	1	5	23	36	0	0	0	0	0	65
7	PAWS ALT	1	9	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	57
8	PAWS ALT	3	15	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	46
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAWS ALT	3	0	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	43

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: 3

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9C is to equal the number reported in column 4B minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against alternate achievement standards.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 6) ¹	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 7) ¹	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 8) ¹	NO VALID SCORE ^{1, 2} (10)	TOTAL ^{1, 3} (11)
3	1001	0	53	20	1074
4	892	0	58	12	962
5	869	0	68	9	946
6	799	0	65	15	879
7	833	0	57	20	910
8	812	0	46	26	884
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	558	0	43	30	631

¹ STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

² Column 10 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 3C plus column 4D plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

³ Column 11 should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in column 1 of Section A. If the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 11 should always equal the sum of the

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL		STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3		1074	6390
4		962	6256
5		946	6324
6		879	6159
7		910	6527
8		884	6660
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	11	631	6062

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B) ¹	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	1002	431	0	0
4	893	439	0	0
5	866	446	0	0
6	800	426	0	0
7	834	381	0	0
8	813	385	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	558	257	0	0

¹ Report those LEP students who, at the time of the reading assessment, were in the United States for less than 12 months and took the English proficiency test in place of the regular reading assessment.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB 1% CAP ¹ (4C)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4D)
3	55	0	55	2	0
4	60	0	60	0	0
5	68	0	68	0	0
6	63	0	63	1	0
7	56	0	56	0	0
8	52	0	52	1	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	45	0	45	0	0

¹ NCLB 1% cap is the limit on the number of **scores on an alternate assessment on alternate achievement standards that can be counted as proficient** AYP calculations. If in 2006-07 your state had an approved exception to the 1% cap as indicated in Section A, use your 2006-07 adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be counted in the lowest achievement level.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) **or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.**

CURRENT DATE:

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE AN ASSESSMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB			
	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (5)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
		PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	0	16	1
4	0	0	5	4
5	0	0	9	3
6	0	0	13	3
7	0	0	20	0
8	0	0	18	1
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	0	0	27	1

¹ In a separate listing, report the number of students exempted for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

CURRENT DATE:

2006-2007

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						9A ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3	PAWS	117	397	396	92	0	0	0	0	0	1002
4	PAWS	187	325	312	69	0	0	0	0	0	893
5	PAWS	230	296	291	49	0	0	0	0	0	866
6	PAWS	208	322	253	17	0	0	0	0	0	800
7	PAWS	230	387	210	7	0	0	0	0	0	834
8	PAWS	264	315	223	11	0	0	0	0	0	813
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAWS	226	209	118	5	0	0	0	0	0	558

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: 3

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3B and 3C.

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	9B ROW TOTAL ¹
3	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAWS ALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is equal to the number reported in Column 4A minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against grade level achievement s

CURRENT DATE:

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	1	2	3	4						9C ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3	PAWS ALT	2	13	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	55
4	PAWS ALT	7	13	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	60
5	PAWS ALT	3	11	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	68
6	PAWS ALT	4	5	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	63
7	PAWS ALT	2	5	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	56
8	PAWS ALT	7	11	23	11	0	0	0	0	0	52
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAWS ALT	1	3	9	32	0	0	0	0	0	45

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: 3

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9C is to equal the number reported in column 4B minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against alternate achievement standards.

2006-2007

STATE: WY - WYOMING

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 15)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 16)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 17)	NO VALID SCORE ² (10)	TOTAL ³ (11)
3	1002	0	55	17	1074
4	893	0	60	9	962
5	866	0	68	12	946
6	800	0	63	16	879
7	834	0	56	20	910
8	813	0	52	19	884
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	558	0	45	28	631

¹ STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

² Column 10 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 3C plus column 4D plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

CURRENT DATE:

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

GO BACK

STATE: WY - WYOMING

Which assessment

Reasons for Exception

	All others were medical exemptions

CURRENT DATE:

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

GO BACK

STATE: WY - WYOMING

Which assessment

Discrepancies

Which assessment	Discrepancies

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

STATE: WY - WYOMING

COMMENTS

Wyoming does not have an alternate assessment against grade level standards.

CURRENT DATE:

Wyoming Parent Survey – Special Education Services

This is a survey for parents of students receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. Please select one answer for each question. **Thank You!**

School's Effort to Partner with Parents	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
1. I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I was offered special assistance (such as child care) so that I could participate in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP)	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services in the regular classroom	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Written information I receive is written in an understandable way	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Teachers are available to speak with me	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Teachers treat me as a team member	1	2	3	4	5	6
Teachers and Administrators:						
13. Seek out parent input	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Encourage me to participate in the decision-making process	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Respect my cultural heritage	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards (the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents)	1	2	3	4	5	6
My Child's School:						
18. Has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Gives me choices with regard to services that address my child's needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Offers parents training about special education issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school	1	2	3	4	5	6

26. Child's Race/Ethnicity (*Circle only one*)

- 1 African-American/Black
- 2 American Indian/Alaskan Native
- 3 Asian/Pacific Islander
- 4 Hispanic or Latino
- 5 White

27. What is your child's PRIMARY disability (*Circle only one*)

- 1 Autism
- 2 Deaf-Blindness
- 3 Deafness
- 4 Developmental Delay
- 5 Emotional Disability
- 6 Hard of Hearing
- 7 Learning Disability
- 8 Mental Retardation
- 9 Multiple Disabilities
- 10 Orthopedic Impairment
- 11 Other Health Impairment
- 12 Speech/Language Impairment
- 13 Traumatic Brain Injury
- 14 Visual Impairment (including Blindness)

28. What is the age of your child? (*circle one*)

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18+

29. What is the grade of your child? (*circle one*)

- Pre-K K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12+

30. What was your child's age when first referred to early intervention or special education? (*circle one*)

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18+

31. The school my child attends is: (*optional*) _____

Answer the following two questions **only** if you want your name entered into the drawing for four \$100 cash prizes. **Your responses will remain confidential.**

32. My name (please print): _____ 33. My phone number: _____

State of Wyoming
Part B Developmental Preschool Family Survey

Name of Developmental Preschool and Site: _____

Region #: _____

Today's Date: _____

If your child is 3 years or older complete this survey.

This is a survey for families receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. *You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.*

A. My Level of Agreement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I am an equal partner with developmental preschool staff members in planning my child's IEP.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have been asked for my opinion about how well developmental preschool services are meeting my child's needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am satisfied with how often the developmental preschool personnel communicate with me about my child's progress on IEP goals.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am able to help my child learn new skills at home.....	1	2	3	4	5
5. I understand my child's special needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am able to tell if my child is making progress	1	2	3	4	5
7. I know what community-based programs and services are available for my child and family	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am satisfied with the help my family has received through the developmental preschool.....	1	2	3	4	5
9. I am satisfied with the developmental preschool services provided to my child.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. I can better meet my child's needs as a result of the services he/she receives at the developmental preschool	1	2	3	4	5
11. I understand my child's needs better as a result of his/her participation at the developmental preschool	1	2	3	4	5
12. My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. Teachers are available to speak with me	1	2	3	4	5
14. The services provided by the preschool have helped my child's development.....	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Developmental preschool staff members:</i>					
15. Listen to my ideas about what my child needs	1	2	3	4	5
16. Consider my input when developing services for my child.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. Explain what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the developmental preschool.....	1	2	3	4	5
18. Allow me to decide what services my child receives	1	2	3	4	5
19. Listen to me when I have a concern	1	2	3	4	5
20. Encourage me to participate in my child's education at the developmental preschool	1	2	3	4	5

B. Activities Surrounding Your Child's IEP

	No	Maybe/ Unsure	Yes
1. I was given an evaluation report prior to my child's most recent IEP meeting.....	1	2	3
2. I was updated on my child's progress at least two times during the past six months.....	1	2	3
3. I know what services my child receives at the preschool	1	2	3
4. My child receives all of the services as outlined on his/her IEP.....			
5. My child's most recent IEP meeting was scheduled at a time and place that was convenient to me	1	2	3
6. Someone at the developmental preschool gave me a copy of the Procedural Safeguards which describes my rights as a parent of a child with disabilities	1	2	3
<i>At your child's most recent IEP meeting, did the IEP team:</i>			
7. Discuss various types of options (such as developmental preschool, home, other child care) for delivering services to your child?	1	2	3
8. Discuss what services your child needs to be successful	1	2	3
9. Discuss what aids and supports your child needs.....	1	2	3
10. Discuss what accommodations and modifications your child needs.....	1	2	3
11. Give you choices with regard to services that addressed your child's needs.....	1	2	3
12. Listen to your opinions and suggestions.....	1	2	3
13. Incorporate your suggestions into the IEP.....	1	2	3

C. Information About My Child

1. My child's age: ____ Years ____ Months

2. My child's age when first referred to early intervention or special education: ____ Years ____ Months

3. My child's race/ethnicity (select one)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 White | 4 Black |
| 2 Hispanic or Latino | 5 Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 3 American Indian or Alaskan Native | 6 Multi-Racial |

4. My Child's Primary Disability (select one)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1 Autism | 8 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 2 Deaf-blindness | 9 Other Health Impairment |
| 3 Deafness | 10 Developmental Disability |
| 4 Emotional Disability | 11 Speech/Language Impairment |
| 5 Hard of Hearing | 12 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 6 Mental Retardation | 13 Visual Impairment (Including Blindness) |
| 7 Multiple Disabilities | 14 Unsure/don't know |

Attachment 3 - Indicator 13

State of Wyoming Special Education Monitoring NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist

State Performance Plan Indicator #13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals.

This questionnaire is to be completed on each of your students with disabilities who are age 16 and older. Look at the IEP for each of these students and then answer the following questions.

1. Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?	Y	N	
Can the goal(s) be counted? Will the goal(s) occur <i>after</i> the student graduates from school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes to both, then circle Y • If a postsecondary goal(s) is not stated, circle N 			
2. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s)?	Y	N	
Is (are) an annual goal(s) included in the IEP that will help the student make progress towards the stated postsecondary goal(s)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, the circle Y 			
3. Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?	Y	N	
Is a type of <i>instruction, related service, community experience, development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, and if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills, and provision of a functional vocational evaluation</i> listed in association with meeting the post-secondary goal(s)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, then circle Y 			
4. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent (or child once the age of majority is reached) consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?	Y	N	NA
For the current year, is there evidence in the IEP that representatives of any of the following agencies/services were invited to participate in the IEP development: <i>postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living or community participation</i> for this post-secondary goal? Was consent obtained from the parent (or child, for a student of the age of majority)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes to both, then circle Y • If it is too early to determine if the student will need outside agency involvement, or no agency is likely to provide or pay for transition services, circle NA • If parent or individual student consent (when appropriate) was not provided, circle NA • If <i>no</i> invitation is evident and a participating agency is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services and there was consent to invite them to the IEP meeting, then circle N 			
5. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?	Y	N	
Is the use of a transition assessment(s) for the postsecondary goal(s) mentioned in the IEP or evident in the student's file? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, then circle Y 			
6. Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?	Y	N	
Do the transition services include courses of study that align with the student's postsecondary goal(s)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, then circle Y 			
7. Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13? (Circle one) Yes (all Ys or NAs are circled) No (one or more Ns circled)			

Instructions for Completing NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist

1. Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?

- Find the transition component of the IEP
- Find the postsecondary goal(s) for this student
- If there are measurable postsecondary goals that address *Education* or *Training* after high school, *Employment* after high school, and (if applicable) *Independent Living* after high school, circle Y
- If there are postsecondary goals that address *Education* or *Training* after high school, *Employment* after high school, and (if applicable) *Independent Living* after high school, but are not measurable, circle N
- If there is not a postsecondary goal that addresses *Education* or *Training*, circle N
- If there is not a postsecondary goal that addresses *Employment* after high school, circle N
- If there is one measurable postsecondary goal that addresses *Education* or *Training*, *Employment*, and (if applicable) *Independent Living* after high school, circle Y
- If there is one postsecondary goal that addresses *Education* or *Training*, *Employment*, and (if applicable) *Independent Living* after high school, but it is not measurable, circle N

2. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s)?

- Find the annual goals in the IEP
- For each postsecondary goal, if there is an annual goal or short-term objective included in the IEP that will help the student make progress towards the stated postsecondary goal, circle Y
- For each postsecondary goal, if there is **no** annual goal or short-term objective included in the IEP that will help the student make progress towards the stated postsecondary goal, circle N

3. Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?

- Find where transition services/activities are listed on the IEP
- For each postsecondary goal, if there is (a) instruction, (b) related service(s), (c) community experience, (d) development of employment and other post-school adult living objective, (e) if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skill(s), or (f) if appropriate, provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the postsecondary goal, circle Y
- For each postsecondary goal, if there is **no** (a) type of instruction, (b) related service, (c) community experience, (d) development of employment and other post-school adult living objective, (e) if appropriate, acquisition of a daily living skill, or (f) if appropriate, provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the postsecondary goal, circle N

4. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent (or child once of the age of majority is reached) consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?

- Find where persons responsible and/or agencies are listed on the IEP
- Are there transition services listed on the IEP that are likely to be provided or paid for by an outside agency? If yes, continue with next guiding question. If no, circle NA.
- Is it too early to determine if this student will need outside agency involvement? If yes, circle NA
- Was parent consent or child consent (once student is the age of majority) to invite an outside agency(ies) is obtained? If yes, continue with next guiding question. If no, circle NA
- If transition services are likely to be provided by an outside agency and if consent was obtained, is there evidence in the IEP or the student's file that any of the following were invited to the IEP meeting to discuss transition: postsecondary education, vocational Prepared by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) September 13, 2006 education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living or community participation for this postsecondary goal? If yes, circle Y. If no, circle N

5. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessment?

- Find where information relates to assessment and the transition component on the IEP (either in the IEP or the student's file)
- For each postsecondary goal, is there evidence that age-appropriate transition assessment provided information on the student's needs, taking into account strengths, preferences, and interests regarding the postsecondary goal(s), circle Y.
- For each postsecondary goal, if there is **no** evidence that age-appropriate transition assessment provided information on the student's needs, taking into account strengths, preferences, and interests regarding the postsecondary goal(s), circle N

6. Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?

- Locate the course of study (instructional program of study) or list of courses of study in the student's IEP
- Does the course of study (or courses) listed align with the student's identified postsecondary goal(s)? If yes, circle Y. If no, circle N.

7. Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13?

- If all Ys or NAs for each item (1 – 6) on the Checklist, then circle **Yes**
- If one or more Ns are circled, then circle **No**

Attachment 4 - Table 7

SECTION A: Written, signed complaints	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	5
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	3
(a) Reports with findings	3
(b) Reports within timeline	3
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	2
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0
SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	1
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	1
(i) Mediation agreements	1
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0
SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	8
(3.1) Resolution sessions	2
(a) Settlement agreements	2
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	2
(a) Decisions within timeline	1
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	1
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	4
SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

State Performance Plan (SPP) February 2008

Wyoming State Report Card for 2006-07

DRAFT -- PRELIMINARY

Jan. 16, 2008

Indic. #	Indicator	Measurement	2006-07 Target	2005-06 Rate	2006-07 Rate	Did State	
						Meet the Target?	State 0607- State0506
1	Graduation Rate	Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	48.50%	50.50%	52.10%	Y	● 1.60%
2	Drop Out Rate	Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	13.80%	12.90%	7.70%	Y	● -5.20%
3	Statewide Assessment	<i>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments (PAWS):</i>					
3A	State AYP Objectives	<i>Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup:</i>					
	Lang. Arts	Percent of elementary school districts.	69.00%	30.00%	96.67%	Y	● 66.67%
	Lang. Arts	Percent of middle school districts.	43.00%	35.70%	93.33%	Y	● 57.63%
	Lang. Arts	Percent of high school districts.	43.00%	0.00%	33.33%	N	● 33.33%
	Math	Percent of elementary school districts.	69.00%	93.30%	100.00%	Y	● 6.70%
	Math	Percent of middle school districts.	51.00%	33.30%	80.00%	Y	● 46.70%
	Math	Percent of high school districts.	20.00%	0.00%	33.33%	Y	● 33.33%
3B	Participation Rate	<i>PAWS Participation rate for children with IEPs:</i>					
	Lang. Arts	Participation rate of grade 3-6 students.	100.00%	98.80%	98.31%	N	● -0.49%
	Lang. Arts	Participation rate of grade 7-8 students.	100.00%	97.80%	97.26%	N	● -0.54%
	Lang. Arts	Participation rate of grade 11 students.	100.00%	95.50%	93.50%	N	● -2.00%
	Math	Participation rate of grade 3-6 students.	100.00%	98.70%	98.73%	N	● 0.03%
	Math	Participation rate of grade 7-8 students.	100.00%	97.90%	97.76%	N	● -0.14%
	Math	Participation rate of grade 11 students.	100.00%	95.20%	95.25%	N	● 0.05%
3C	Proficiency Rate	<i>PAWS Proficiency rate for children with IEPs:</i>					
	Lang. Arts	Percent of grade 3-6 students.	42.00%	29.50%	37.48%	N	● 7.98%
	Lang. Arts	Percent of grade 7-8 students.	45.42%	21.30%	28.92%	N	● 7.62%
	Lang. Arts	Percent of grade 11 students.	57.00%	19.90%	29.15%	N	● 9.25%
	Math	Percent of grade 3-6 students.	36.50%	40.60%	61.58%	Y	● 20.98%
	Math	Percent of grade 7-8 students.	37.75%	17.60%	29.58%	N	● 11.98%
	Math	Percent of grade 11 students.	46.50%	15.10%	19.80%	N	● 4.70%
5	LRE for Students	<i>Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 who are:</i>					
5A	Regular Classroom	Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.00%	55.54%	57.32%	Y	● 1.78%
5B	Separate Classroom	Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	9.52%	9.15%	8.62%	Y	● -0.53%
5C	Separate Facilities	Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.45%	2.63%	2.76%	N	● 0.13%
6	LRE for Children 3-5	<i>Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.</i>					
6.1		3-5 Year-old Preschoolers	71.73%	71.03%			
6.2		5-year-old Kindergartners	71.73%	94.80%			
7	Child Outcomes for Children 3-5	<i>Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</i>		<i>Target will be set for 07-08</i>			
7A	Social-Emotional	Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).			96.55%		
7B	Knowledge and Skills	Aquiring and using knowledge and skills			96.55%		
7C	Behaviors	Taking Appropriate action to meet needs			91.38%		

Indic. #	Indicator	Measurement	2006-07 Target	2005-06 Rate	2006-07 Rate	Did State	
						Meet the Target?	State 0607- State0506
8	Parent Involvement	<i>Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</i>	<i>Target will be set for 06-07</i>				
8.1	Part B 619	Preschool (Age 3-5)	70.70%	70.20%	76.50%	Y	6.30%
8.2	Part B	K-12		51.28%	58.60%		7.32%
9	Disprop. R/E, Overall	<i>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in related services categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</i>	0.00%	0.00%	TBD		
9.1	Cautionary	What percent of districts have ratios flagged at the Cautionary Level ?		14.60%	4.17%		-10.43%
9.2	Disproportionate	What percent of districts have ratios flagged at the Disproportionate Level ?		0.00%	2.08%		2.08%
9.3	Significant	What percent of districts have ratios flagged at the Significant Disproportionate Level ?		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%
10	Disprop. R/E, Disability Category	<i>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</i>	0.00%	0.00%	TBD		
10.1	Cautionary	What percent of districts have ratios flagged at the Cautionary Level ?		14.60%	29.17%		14.57%
10.2	Disproportionate	What percent of districts have ratios flagged at the Disproportionate Level ?		8.30%	12.50%		4.20%
10.3	Significant	What percent of districts have ratios flagged at the Significant Disproportionate Level ?		8.30%	12.50%		4.20%
11	Evaluation in 60 Days	Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.					
11.1	Part B 619	Preschool (Age 3-5)	100.00%	95.43%			
11.2	Part B	K-12	100.00%	74.50%	86.06%	N	11.56%
12	Transition from Part C to Part B	Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	100.00%	68.29%			
13	Transition Planning on IEP by Age 16	Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.	100.00%	50.80%	62.51%	N	11.71%
14	Post-secondary Outcomes	Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	<i>Target will be set for 07-08</i>		83.45%		
15	GS: Noncompliance Correction	Percent of noncompliance [including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.] corrected within one year of identification.	100.00%	100.00%			
16	GS: Written complaints	Percent of written complains resolved within 60 days	100.00%	100.00%			
17	GS: Due Process	Percents of adjudicated due process hearings that were adjudicated	100.00%	100.00%			
18	GS: Resolution Settlements	Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions	100.00%	100.00%			
19	GS: Mediations	Percent of mediations that resulted in mediation agreements	100.00%	100.00%			
20	GS: Timely and Accurate Data	Percent of state-reported data that are timely and accurate.					
20.1	Timely	Percent of state-reported data that are timely.	100.00%	100.00%			
20.2	Accurate	Percent of state-reported data that are accurate.	100.00%	100.00%			