



**Wyoming
State Performance Plan
For Special Education
FFY 2005-2012**

**Special Programs Division
320 West Main Street
Riverton, WY 82501
<http://edu.wyoming.gov>**

**December 2, 2005
Updated February 1, 2012**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Pages |
|--|--------------|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Acronym List..... | 10 |
| Indicator 1: High School Graduation Rate..... | 13 |
| Indicator 2: High School Dropout Rate..... | 19 |
| Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment..... | 23 |
| Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion..... | 32 |
| Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion, by Race and Ethnicity..... | 37 |
| Indicator 5: Placement of Students, Ages 6-21..... | 42 |
| Indicator 6: Placement of Preschool Children, Ages 3-5..... | 45 |
| Indicator 7: Performance, Ages 3-5..... | 48 |
| Indicator 8: Parental Involvement..... | 57 |
| Indicator 9: Disproportionality, Overall Identification..... | 66 |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionality, Specific Disability..... | 71 |
| Indicator 11: Timely Evaluations..... | 76 |
| Indicator 12: Transition from Part C to Part B..... | 83 |
| Indicator 13: Transition, Ages 16+..... | 86 |
| Indicator 14: Transition, Post School Outcomes..... | 92 |
| Indicator 15: General Supervision..... | 97 |
| Indicator 16: Formal Complaints..... | 103 |
| Indicator 17: Due Process..... | 107 |
| Indicator 18: Resolution Sessions..... | 111 |
| Indicator 19: Mediations..... | 115 |
| Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data..... | 119 |
| Attachments..... | 123 |

Introduction

The Individuals with Disabilities Education act (IDEA) of 2004 established a requirement that all states develop and submit to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) a performance plan designed to move the state from its current level of compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the law and to improve the educational and functional outcomes for children with disabilities. The state plan must encompass baseline data (where available), projected targets, and activities to achieve those targets for twenty indicators that are included in this plan. The state is required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) in the years following the submission of this six-year state performance plan in order to inform OSEP and our stakeholders in Wyoming on the progress toward meeting those targets. This document fulfills the first step of that process - the State Performance Plan for Special Education in Wyoming.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development

Introduction

The Wyoming Department of Education Special Programs Division (WDE) implements a general supervision system that aligns with both the letter and spirit of IDEA. Since the IDEA reauthorization of 2004, the WDE has worked tirelessly to develop, implement, and refine an SPP/APR process that is not merely a vehicle for reporting to OSEP and the public on statewide data. In addition to those basic goals, the WDE has sought to ensure that its SPP and each APR are essential parts of a holistic system of general supervision: one that is integrated, robust, and responsive to data represented in the SPP/APR indicators. Ultimately, the SPP and APR process must play an integral role in continuously improving educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.


The reauthorized statute's emphasis on outcomes and results marked an important change from previous versions of IDEA. IDEA 2004 requires SEAs to monitor and enforce the implementation of the Act and to report annually on performance. As described in the federal regulations, the primary focus of an SEA's monitoring activities must be on 1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities, and 2) ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. In addition, SEAs must use quantifiable indicators and such qualitative indicators as are needed to measure performance adequately on the indicators promulgated by the U. S. Department of Education, and must monitor the LEAs located in the State using indicators adequate to measure performance in:

- Provision of FAPE in the least restrictive environment,
- State exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services, and
- Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification (34 C.F.R. §300.600).

In order to fulfill these mandates, the WDE is implementing a system of general supervision that has *data* at its core—with a particular emphasis on data representing student outcomes. The Department uses a diagram modeled after a planetary gear set to illustrate the interrelated nature of the system's components (see below). In early 2007, the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) identified seven other essential components of effective Part B general supervision: Fiscal Management; Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation; Dispute Resolution;

Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions; Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development; Integrated Monitoring Activities; and the State Performance Plan itself. In the WDE’s system, each of these various components must both contribute to and respond to various facets of state and district data. Additionally, decisions made about particular activities within each component must be based upon data, and in return, effective execution of activities within each component must also achieve the desired effect on improving the data at the center of the system.

In the WDE’s system, information and activities in one component are not isolated: as one component “gear” turns, related data are affected and other components move in response. At different times, any component can act as the drive gear in this system and, as activities are completed, new data are generated and analyzed regularly to determine whether or not the State’s activities are contributing to the desired effect on student outcomes. In this way, all of the system’s components articulate and inform each other as the State implements its Part B general supervision system.



In September of every year, the State conducts its statewide data drilldown meeting, during which the WDE measures the effectiveness of the prior year’s efforts and plans activities. This is considered the primary annual activity in the state’s general supervision system. As such, all WDE Special Programs Division staff members are required to attend the event, along with external consultants and representatives from other WDE divisions (such as Administration, Federal Programs, and Assessment). During this multi-day activity, attendees closely review the most recent data available concerning the performance of students with disabilities across each of the SPP indicators. In addition, the team reviews a multitude of data concerning identification rates, special education and related service

information, the provision of Assistive Technology, Extended School Year, attendance, discipline and more. Data are disaggregated by a variety of variables including by disability category, environment, statewide assessment performance, age, gender, race and ethnicity.

Throughout the drilldown process, the WDE team identifies areas of troubling performance that could signify a potential problem with the provision of FAPE in the LRE. To illustrate the process, the following are two examples¹ of how this played out during the September 2010 statewide data drilldown meeting.

- In reviewing statewide data, the team discovered troubling graduation and dropout rate data for students in certain “low incidence” disability categories. Drilling further into the data, the WDE noted that students eligible in these disability categories appeared to be disproportionately represented in negative outcomes data reports. In particular, the data showed that no more than 1.2% of students with disabilities placed in Regular Education environments carried an eligibility label of Traumatic Brain Injury, Hearing Impairment, Multiple Disabilities, or Visual Impairment. Students in these categories were also less likely to graduate with a regular diploma and appeared to be over-represented among students with disabilities who dropped out of school² from 2006 – 2010. The WDE decided to explore the provision of FAPE to students in these categories on each of the 2010 – 2011 on-site CIFM visits by creating a stable hypothesis probing the provision of FAPE for each student eligible in one of the aforementioned disability categories.
- In reviewing Indicator 1 and 2 data, the WDE noted that Native American students with disabilities were much less likely to graduate and much more likely to drop out than their peers of other races and ethnicities. Specifically, the WDE discovered that just 39% of the state’s Native American students with disabilities graduated (using the Indicator 1 measurement), while 66% of white students graduated. In addition, dropout rates were also much higher for Native American students with disabilities—as high as 75% in certain districts. In response to these data, Special Programs Division staff members agreed that LEA service providers are in need of a greater level of assistance and professional development regarding the special needs of this population. The Special Programs Division and other WDE divisions then collaborated to plan and host Wyoming’s 1st Annual Native American Education Conference on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

In short, the WDE pursues all promising avenues during the statewide data drilldown in order to achieve two objectives: 1) the Department determines whether or not activities undertaken during the prior year have been effective in improving key data, and 2) the State notes areas of poor performance upon which to focus during the upcoming school year(s). As illustrated by the preceding examples, the WDE uses this annual data review to identify topics and audiences for professional development and technical assistance and to set priorities for monitoring. However, information from the statewide data drilldown is also used to identify specific areas in which guidance documents are needed, plan focused fiscal oversight, determine staffing needs and more. Ultimately, evaluation of the effectiveness of each activity takes place through measuring the data changes that have or have not taken place. Thus, all of the WDE’s general supervision activities begin and end with data—data regarding student results and outcomes, receipt of FAPE in the LRE, child find, transition, and potential disproportionality.

¹ The WDE’s FFY 2010 Improvement Activities Chart includes both of these examples under the Indicators 1 and 2 (see Appendix A).

² During the 2009 – 2010 school year, Wyoming had 513 students in these disability categories in its schools: 87 BI, 175 HI, 183 MU, and 68 VI. From the 2005 – 2006 school year through the 2009 – 2010 school year, 7 BI students, 7 HI students, 5 MU students, and 5 VI students dropped out of school (exit code ‘DO’). Over these same five school years, 26 BI students, 23 HI students, 3 MU students, and 14 VI students graduated (exit code ‘GD’).

Wyoming's revised SPP describes the annual strategies the State is employing in its general supervision system. The State considers each of these recurring activities completed within its general supervision system to be improvement activities, since all of them must contribute to ever improving educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. Specific improvement activities for the most recent federal fiscal year are included with this report as Attachment 7.

Wyoming's Broad Stakeholder Input

The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) gathered and analyzed three-year trend data for the development of the State Performance Plan first using internal teams comprised of staff from the Special Programs Division. The broad stakeholder involvement began with the dissemination of the indicators and trend data to the following groups: Local special education directors, staff and parents; the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD); the Wyoming Transition Council; members of the Wyoming Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and special education teachers and related service providers from across the State of Wyoming. The first group of stakeholders, including members of the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), met with staff from WDE in May 2005 to review the requirements of the State Performance Plan as included in IDEA 2004. Each of the twenty indicators was reviewed with this group of local special education directors, and input was received and noted. The WDE Special Programs Division met with the local special education directors again during the WASEA fall meeting in September 2005 to review the SPP indicators including baseline data in order to obtain input for targets and improvement activities. The WAPSD reviewed the plan's indicators along with the initial data provided by the Special Programs Division once in the spring and again in the fall of 2005 in an intensive two-day meeting facilitated by Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center. This group carefully considered the baseline data, three-year trend data, and provided invaluable input for the targets and improvement activities for all twenty indicators. The same information was shared by the WDE Special Programs Division during the fall meeting of the Wyoming Chapter of CEC meeting which included over 200 special education teachers, related service providers, general education teachers, district administrators, Protection and Advocacy, and parent advocates. Many questions were entertained and feedback provided by the group. The Wyoming Transition Council which includes members from local districts, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), community college and University of Wyoming staff, and personnel from Residential Treatment and Juvenile Detention Centers, gave input at their fall meeting particularly to indicators 13 and 14 regarding transition and post school outcomes. Indicators 13 and 14 were also reviewed with the Wyoming Vocational Rehabilitation Council for their feedback concerning transition for students with disabilities. The advisory group Wyoming Partnership Advisory Team (WyPAT), which includes stakeholders who provide direction for the Wyoming State Improvement Grant activities, also gave input to WDE concerning the targets and improvement activities for all of the indicators included in the State Performance Plan.

The Intermediate Education Unit (IEU) and lead agency for Part B 619 Services in Wyoming is the Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD) which is housed within the Wyoming Department of Health. The Early Intervention and Education Program (EIEP), under the direction of the DDD is responsible for providing special education and related services to preschool children ages three through five in regional centers across the State of Wyoming. The DDD worked with additional stakeholders specifically around indicators 6 through 8, 12 and the indicators pertinent to monitoring and accountability. Those stakeholder groups included the State Early Intervention Council (EIC) and directors and family members from each of the fourteen regional Preschool Development Centers. The EIC membership includes parents who have young children with special needs, directors from the Child Development Centers (CDCs), service providers from the CDCs, state legislators, staff from higher education, Parent

Information Center (PIC), (Wyoming's PTI) consultants, and representatives from both the Wyoming Departments of Education and Health, preschool providers, and other key community representatives. The DDD also worked with National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) staff to provide technical assistance and SPP training to the EIC. Directors, staff and parents from the CDCs were also included as critical stakeholders in the development of measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities for the indicators specific to preschool children with disabilities throughout the development of Wyoming's State Performance Plan.

After developing a draft of the State Performance Plan, the WDE assembled a work group to provide input on the indicators and targets. This group was comprised of stakeholders from WASEA, the Wyoming Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health (UPLIFT), staff from the DDD and the EIC, staff from the WDE Technology, Careers, and Data Divisions, and the Assistant Attorney General for the State of Wyoming. This meeting was hosted by the WDE staff via our Wyoming Education Network video conferencing system, which allowed for a face-to-face discussion of targets, improvement activities and timelines. Through this kind of stakeholder involvement, WDE was able to set rigorous and measurable targets for each performance indicator.

WDE used statistically sound practices in determining targets for each indicator carefully accounting for our very small population. Wyoming is categorized as a frontier state with an exceptionally low population density. The total population for the state as of the last official census is just under 500,000. Total public school enrollment for the 2004-2005 school year was 84,164 students, with a corresponding special education Child Count of approximately 12,000 students. Our largest school district has an enrollment of 12,884 students and the smallest district has an enrollment of 93 students. Fifty percent of Wyoming's districts are eligible under the Small, Rural School Achievement Program (SRSA). Wyoming's population would be considered only marginally diverse. Three of our smallest school districts are on the Wind River Indian Reservation and have school populations that are 98% Native American, 99% qualifying for free and reduced lunch. WDE will carefully consider each district's demographics when annually determining significant discrepancies in their data for children with disabilities.

The initial draft of the State Performance Plan was placed on the WDE website (http://edu.wyoming.gov/Programs/special_education/spp_apr.aspx) in order to elicit further stakeholder input. All stakeholder input was used to revise the draft and ultimately create the final document for submission to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs for approval, December 2, 2005. Within 120 days, Wyoming will receive final approval of the State Performance Plan which will drive special education program accountability in the state for the subsequent six years.

Wyoming State Performance Plan Dissemination to the Public

Following the submission of the Wyoming State Performance Plan to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, the WDE Special Programs Division will post the final version of the SPP on the WDE website and will alert constituency groups via existing list serves of that posting. Hard copies of the SPP will also be provided to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the DDD along with any individuals making a request for a copy. Hard copies will also be made available for public review at the Wyoming Department of Education, Special Programs Division offices in Riverton and Cheyenne. Public notice about the availability of the Wyoming SPP will be made in a press release to major Wyoming newspapers, radio and television stations through the reporting process at the Wyoming Department of Education. These same constituents will be apprised of any changes that become necessary to the SPP pending OSEP's final approval. In addition, the SPP will be sent to each

county library to enhance accessibility to the general public. WDE will work with the PIC to facilitate getting pertinent information to parents of students with disabilities across the state. Parents of students with disabilities will also be contacted via the University of Wyoming's Wyoming Institute for Disabilities (WIND) with information about how to access the SPP either electronically or in hard copy; including parents whose children attend a CDC. Copies of the SPP document will also be shared with collaborative teams and parents during monitoring visits by the WDE Special Programs Division.

Annual Report to the Public Regarding the Measurable and Rigorous Targets

In accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(C)(ii), the WDE will report 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 Division will report annually using the Annual Performance Report and individual local education agency/intermediate education unit (LEA/IEU) reports as a vehicle to determine progress toward the established targets. The Special Programs Division will collaborate with the Technology, Careers, and Data Division to develop the mechanisms needed to accomplish this reporting task. A member of the Special Programs Division sits on the advisory committee for the State Data Advisory Group. The annual reports will be reviewed by the WDE and the DDD as part of the Focused Monitoring process to determine the need for technical assistance and professional development to better meet the identified needs and academic outcomes of children with disabilities.

Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process

The Wyoming Department of Education's Special Programs Division previously conducted compliance monitoring of its 48 local school districts on a five-year rotating cycle. In addition, an audit of the IEU was completed annually which included monitoring visits to their 619 sub-contractors (CDCs). The previous cycle began during the 1999-2000 school year and ended in the spring of the 2004-2005. The new monitoring cycle began during the 2005-2006 school year and was not changed significantly from the previous cycle. At that time, however, the State's monitoring system underwent a comprehensive evaluation by an external contractor. With the results of that evaluation, the system was significantly modified, and data was reviewed to include an annual focused monitoring component around the indicators included in the SPP.

The previous monitoring process was a comprehensive program review that looked at all of the components of IDEA procedural requirements of general supervision included in 34 CFR §300.600. The process ensured that the requirements of Part B were carried out and that each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the State was under the general supervision of the WDE Special Programs Division and met the standards of the WDE. The 48 local school districts and the Developmental Disabilities Division of the Wyoming Department of Health are included under the definition of LEA or IEU. Although the 48 districts were monitored on a five-year rotating cycle, the EIEP was monitored each year to ensure that its monitoring process guaranteed a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for children with disabilities ages 3-5 in each of the 14 regional Preschool Development Centers.

Any findings of non-compliance by the WDE required the LEA or IEU develop a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) addressing each area. The QIP included a process for correcting the non-compliance and the timeline of activities ensuring that the non-compliance was corrected within one year. In alignment with the OSEP's continuous improvement monitoring process, the following areas were reviewed for each school district's or IEU's special education programs: General Supervision, Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment, Parent Involvement, and Secondary Transition.

Due to the results of the outside evaluation conducted in August 2005 and the current IDEA requirements for outcome-based compliance monitoring, the WDE Special Programs Division has undertaken a comprehensive “overhaul” of its monitoring system.

Continuous Improvement & Data-based Focused Monitoring System

The SPP has increased data accountability, and in response, Wyoming designed a comprehensive data-based monitoring system to meet the numerous challenges of a rural state with limited resources.

The monitoring system framework includes the following components: stable and risk-based self-assessment, on-site targeted and on-site random focused monitoring and IDEA compliance monitoring. The SPP indicators are used as a guide: each indicator is assigned to at least one of the system components. Data disaggregation is used as a key problem-identifying tool and as a monitoring and self-monitoring tool to aid in the creation of compliance hypotheses by the WDE. The system is designed to balance all SPP indicators with measurable student outcomes and allows for opportunities to examine all the other IDEA regulations simultaneously.

The self-assessment component is comprised of two subsets: stable and risk-based. The stable self-assessment is completed annually by all LEAs and IEUs and includes a student file review, transition check list, data accuracy verification, suspension/expulsion data, and out-of-district placement data. The risk-based self assessment is completed by any LEA or IEU whose data fall outside a defined range. This data set includes district adequate yearly progress (AYP) status, statewide assessment participation rates, disproportionality and evaluation timelines. Finally, the on-site component is determined with a weighted system using a combination of these indicators: graduation rate, dropout rate, statewide assessment proficiency rate, and least restrictive environment data. Parent survey data and due process complaints also influence the on-site decision.

Using the weighted formula, districts are selected for on-site monitoring from three population categories: small, medium, and large. Districts are ranked annually based on percentages taken from the weighted system. WDE then selects the three lowest performers from each population category for on-site monitoring. In addition to the nine LEAs selected through this process, four additional LEAs, institutions and IEUs are randomly selected for on-site monitoring.

Similar to the stakeholder group assembled to develop the SPP, WDE formed a stakeholder group to assist the department in developing its new monitoring system. The stakeholder group includes district staff, parents, advocates, representatives from other state agencies and policy makers. Because this group represents various organizations and views, members provide valuable perspectives to this process. The stakeholder group assists the State in identifying priority indicators used in selecting districts for on-site monitoring, selecting targets and triggers, and reviewing the indicators and the results of the monitoring system annually. The priority indicators may change annually as a result of this review.

The comprehensive nature and flexibility of Wyoming’s new procedure allows WDE to monitor school districts, regional Preschool Development Centers (in collaboration with the EIEP) and institution facilities, and incorporates components of compliance, continuous improvement and focus monitoring systems. Wyoming’s monitoring design is multi-dimensional, since no single system fully allows a state to satisfy its general supervision role. As a small state with limited resources and capacities, the new system will allow the WDE to carry out all general supervision requirements more efficiently.

Provision of Technical Assistance, IDEA Reauthorization & Guidance Documents

The WDE is developing guidance documents to assist districts in implementing IDEA 2004 as it promulgates new state special education rules: revised Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children

with Disabilities. In most cases, these documents will have a focus on improved academic outcomes for children with disabilities. Several regional trainings will be held to help districts and IEUs maintain or improve compliance with IDEA 2004. Model forms will be developed as a guide for districts' use in ensuring that their IEPs are in compliance with IDEA 2004.

Data Sources

The WDE is implementing the Wyoming Integrated Statewide Education Data System (WISE), a system that will connect the several different software systems and/or databases within local school districts. When WISE is in place, local schools will only have to enter data once, and it will flow to all the other applications that require it. WISE will be used to assist districts in meeting requirements for the collection, formatting and reporting school and district data as needed by the Wyoming Department of Education's mandated reports. The biggest benefit, however, will be the ability to share educational data statewide, district to district, district to school and school to school. By utilizing WISE, the burden on the districts and schools associated with data collection and management will be significantly reduced.

WISE is focused on establishing a system for sharing and reporting data that is stored at the local districts on their internal software packages. The planned WISE system will change how the State collects data from districts and schools. Using the national data standards with Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) will ensure compatibility, consistency and comparability of the data statewide without mandating specific software applications for districts and schools. SIF will permit the districts and schools to select the "best of breed" software packages to support their data requirements. WISE will be able to access the data from these various systems for government 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 National 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 will offload 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 be instrumental in saving the districts numerous hours that have been required for district, school, state and federal reporting. A WISE Data System with timely and accurate data about each student will improve the quality of education for every student in Wyoming.

SEA Resources

WDE utilizes research-proven resources available from a variety of sources. The Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) provides valuable ongoing services and technical assistance to the Special Programs Division and to LEA staff across Wyoming. Throughout the last year, the WDE has received direct technical assistance from these OSEP-funded centers: Access Center; National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities; Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO); National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCREST); Westat's Technical Assistance in Data Collection, Analysis, and Report Preparation; National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC); National Post-School Outcomes Center; National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET); Center for Improving Teacher Quality (CTQ); Center on Positive Behavioral

Interventions and Supports (PBIS) through the University of Oregon; Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), and MPRRC. WDE has used tools and information provided by National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM), National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), and National Association of State Director of Special Education (NASDSE). WDE consultants also participated in the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD) conference in the spring of 2006.

Additional resources will be added as they become available, whether at the state, regional or national level. Those resources are reflected in the *Acronym List for the State Performance Plan* as well as in the Improvement Activities for each indicator as they are revised through the APR submitted to OSEP on February 1st of each year.

Summary

This overview is intended to provide the reader with knowledge about the Wyoming State Department of Education's process for accountability and monitoring that are the backbone of ensuring compliance with IDEA 2004. The ultimate goal is that of improved outcomes for over 12,000 children with disabilities ages three through 21 across the State of Wyoming.

The State Performance Plan, with 20 separate indicators, baseline data, six-year targets and improvement activities, follows. Each indicator has been written with broad stakeholder input in order to provide the long-term goals for special education in Wyoming; provide updates to the APR prepared in March 2005; and provides a plan for collecting data for new indicators to be reported in the APR of February 2007. Measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities have been identified for indicators with baseline data.

Staff members from the WDE Special Programs Division extend their heartfelt gratitude to our stakeholders for the invaluable input we have received over the last several months.

Acronym List for the State Performance Plan

Acronym Definition

| | |
|-------|--|
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 |
| APR | Annual Performance Report |
| AT | Assistive Technology |
| AYP | Adequate Yearly Progress |
| BHD | Behavioral Health Division (formerly the Developmental Disabilities Division or DDD) |
| BI | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| BOCES | Board of Cooperative Education Services |
| CADRE | Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education |
| CAP | Corrective Action Plan |
| CAST | Center for Applied Special Technology |
| CCSSO | Council of Chief State School Officers |
| CD | Cognitive Disability |
| CDC | Child Development Center |
| CEC | Council for Exceptional Children |
| CEIS | Coordinated Early Intervening Services |
| CITEd | Center for Implementing Technology in Education |
| COPS | Court Ordered Placed Students |
| COSF | Child Outcomes Summary Form |
| CSPR | Consolidated State Performance Report |
| DAC | Data Accountability Center |
| DDD | Developmental Disabilities Division (now known as the BHD) |
| DDE | Data Driven Enterprises |
| DHH | Deaf and Hard of Hearing |
| DVR | Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Program |
| ECO | Early Childhood Outcomes |
| ED | Emotional Disability |
| EDEN | Education Data Exchange Network |
| EDHI | Early Hearing Detection and Intervention |
| EIC | Early Intervention Council |
| EIEP | Early Intervention and Education Program |
| EIMAC | Educational Information Management Advisory Consortium |
| EMAPS | EdFacts Metadata and Process System |
| ESEA | Elementary and Secondary Education Act |
| ESS | EDEN Submission System |
| ESY | Extended School Year |
| FAPE | Free Appropriate Public Education |
| FAQ | Frequently Asked Questions |
| FCTD | Family Center on Technology and Disability |
| FFY | Federal Fiscal Year |
| HI | Hearing Impairment |
| IDEA | Individuals with Disabilities Education Act |
| IEP | Individualized Education Program |
| IEU | Intermediate Education Unit |
| IFSP | Individualized Family Service Plan |
| IRIS | IDEA '04 and Research for Inclusive Settings Center |
| LD | Learning Disability |
| LEA | Local Education Agency |
| LRE | Least Restrictive Environment |

| | |
|------------|---|
| MOE | Maintenance of Effort |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MPRRC | Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center |
| MU | Multiple Disabilities |
| <i>n</i> | Group Size (number) |
| NASDSE | National Association State Directors of Special Education |
| NATTAP | Network of Autism Training and Technical Assistance Programs |
| NCCRESt | National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems |
| NCDB | National Consortium on Deaf-Blindness |
| NCEO | National Center on Educational Outcomes |
| NCES | National Center for Educational Statistics |
| NCLB | No Child Left Behind Act |
| NCSEAM | National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring |
| NECTAC | National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center |
| NICHCY | National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities |
| NIMAS | National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard |
| NIMAS/CAST | National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard Development and Technical Assistance Center |
| NIRN | National Implementation Research Network |
| NIUSI | National Institute for Urban School Improvement |
| NPDCI | National Professional Development Center on Inclusion |
| NPSO | National Post School Outcomes Center |
| NRCLD | National Research Center on Learning Disabilities |
| NSTTAC | National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center |
| NWRCC | Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center |
| NWREL | Northwest Regional Education Laboratory |
| OESE | Office of Elementary and Secondary Education |
| OSEP | Office of Special Education Programs |
| P & A | Protection and Advocacy |
| PACER | Technical Assistance ALLIANCE for Parents Center |
| PAWS | Proficiency Assessment of Wyoming Students |
| PAWS-ALT | Proficiency Assessment of Wyoming Students – Alternate Assessment |
| PBIS | Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports |
| PD | Professional Development |
| PIC | Parent Information Center |
| PLAAFP | Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance |
| PSC | Partners Support Contractors |
| PTI | Parent Training and Information Centers |
| QIP | Quality Improvement Plan |
| RRFC | Regional Resource and Federal Center Network |
| RtI | Response to Intervention |
| SEA | State Education Agency |
| SIF | Schools Interoperability Framework |
| SPDG | State Personnel Development Grant |
| SPP | State Performance Plan |
| SWD | Students With Disabilities |
| SWIS | School Wide Information System |
| TAESE | Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education |
| TA | Technical Assistance |
| TBI | Traumatic Brain Injury |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| UPLIFT | Wyoming Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health |
| USDE | United States Department of Education |
| VI | Visual Impairment |
| WAESP | Wyoming Association of Elementary School Principals |
| WAPSD | Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities |
| WASEA | Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators |
| WASSP | Wyoming Association of Secondary School Principals |
| WATR | Wyoming Assistive Technology Resource Center |
| WDE | Wyoming Department of Education |
| WDH | Wyoming Department of Health |
| WEA | Wyoming Education Association |
| WedGATE | Wyoming Education Gateway |
| WIND | Wyoming Institute for Disabilities |
| WISE | Wyoming Integrated Statewide Education Data System |
| WRIR | Wind River Indian Reservation |
| WyCAS | Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System |
| WyCAS Alt | Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System Alternate Assessment |
| WYPAT | Wyoming Partnership Advisory Team |
| WYPEC | Wyoming Para educators Conference |
| WYSAC | Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center |
| WYSIG | Wyoming State Improvement Grant |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: 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: Wyoming uses the Federal Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate or “on-time” graduation rate.

$$\text{On-Time Graduation Rate} = \frac{\text{On-Time Graduates}}{\text{Expected On-Time Graduates}}$$

A graduation cohort is a group of students who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year, which is then adjusted over time by adding any students transferring into a cohort in a school and by subtracting any students who transfer out or are otherwise allowed to be removed from the cohort.

Data Source: Wyoming uses the same data reported in the *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The release of graduation rates for the class of 2009-10 marks the first time that Wyoming has used a cohort four-year graduation rate. Wyoming is using this calculation in order to comply with the *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001*. This graduation rate includes only “on-time” graduates who earn regular high school diplomas within four years of entering high school. This establishes a uniform and accurate way of calculating high school graduation rates that will be comparable across states.

Use of this formula is possible because all Wyoming students have been assigned unique student identifiers (called WISER IDs) since the 2005-06 school year. This procedure of uniquely identifying student records enables the tracking of students across districts and school years. School districts have been reporting student level enrollment data to the Wyoming Department of Education since Fall 2005, and student level dropout and completion data to the Department since 2006-07. More recently, federal regulation requires the reporting of explicit exit-reason categories for each student exit event to the WDE, including various types of valid, documented transfers.

The on-time graduation cohort year is assigned as the end of the fourth school year after (and including) the school year in which a student is first enrolled in 9th grade in a Wyoming public school. A transfer into a cohort occurs when a student first enrolls in a Wyoming public school in any high school grade, 9 through 12. A transfer out of a cohort occurs when a student leaves a school and enrolls in another school or in an educational program that culminates in the award of a regular high school diploma. Federally defined documentation requirements exist to validate the reporting of a student as having transferred to another diploma-awarding educational program or to a home schooling environment. A student who is retained in grade,

enrolls in a GED program, or leaves school for any other reason may not be counted in the four-year or extended-year graduation rate as a transfer and must remain in the original cohort (i.e., must be included in the denominator of the graduation rate for that cohort) (34 C.F.R.

§200.19(b)(1)(ii)(B)(2)).

The following formula provides an example of the four-year graduation rate for the cohort entering 9th grade for the first time in the fall of the 2006-07 school year. The expected four-year (on-time) graduation date for this cohort is the end of the 2009-10 school year.

$$\text{2009-10 Four-Year adjusted Cohort graduation rate} = \frac{\text{Number of students in cohort who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the 2009~10 school year}}{\text{Number of students first entering 9th grade during the 2006~07 school year plus later transfers into the state, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die prior to the end of the 2009~10 school year}}$$

For students who moved between Wyoming public schools, student records were updated to reflect the correct district and building location. These students were considered "transfers out" of the district/building they left and "transfers in" to the district/building they entered. Students who exited the public school system entirely (out of state, to non-public school, or home school) or died at any time during the four-year period are removed from the cohort. Exit Type Codes are used by schools to determine the reason a student leaves the school system for any cause. Full explanations of each Exit Code can be found in the [WDE684 Guidebook](#). A brief listing of each code is found at the end of this document, in Appendix A. Students who graduate earlier than their cohort are reported with an exit date reflecting the actual date the diploma was granted. These students will be counted as on-time graduates with their cohort.

Students who graduate during a summer session and complete their diploma requirements prior to the start of the next school year are counted with the previous spring graduates. For example, a student who receives their diploma on 8/10/2010 will be counted as a graduate in the 2009-10 school year. A student who completes on 10/15/2010 will be counted as a graduate in the 2010-11 school year.

Graduation rates are required to be reported to the public as general information and for research use, are used in federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for schools and districts, and are reported to the United States Department of Education and for use in federal reports such as National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) state profiles.

The Wyoming Department of Education plans to calculate and publish five-year graduation rates for the 2009-10 cohort in December 2011. This rate will include students who entered 9th grade for the first time in the fall of the 2006-07 school year and earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the 2010-11 school year. The Department has not determined the extent to which extended year graduation rates will be used for accountability.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

| School Year | Overall Graduation Rates * | Number of Overall Graduates * | Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities | Number of Graduating Students with Disabilities |
|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 1998-1999 | 76.7 | 6,348 | 39.39 | 334 |
| 1999-2000 | 77.2 | 6,469 | 42.64 | 388 |
| 2000-2001 | 76.0 | 6,063 | 49.45 | 446 |
| 2001-2002 | 77.0 | 6,106 | 46.07 | 434 |
| 2002-2003 | 77.2 | 5,843 | 45.72 | 427 |
| 2003-2004 | 79.3 | 5,830 | 48.47 | 490 |
| 2004-2005 | 81.5 | 5,614 | 48.13 | 438 |

* Overall graduation data includes both students without and with disabilities from the cohorts for each of the past four years.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The WDE database does not currently include the “n” for students without disabilities because the rate is determined based on a cohort that does not differentiate subgroups. Data for students with disabilities is a specific data collection. Therefore, the WDE is able to determine graduation numbers and data for the subgroup.

Over the past seven years, the graduation rate for students with disabilities varied from a low of 39.39% to a high of 49.45%. Since 1999, the graduation rate for students with disabilities has improved, slightly narrowing the gap between students overall and students with disabilities.

The State Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities expressed concern about the new graduation requirements that were mandated by the Wyoming legislature to go into effect beginning with the 2005-2006 school year. These requirements stipulate that a student must be proficient in five of the nine content area standards to receive a regular diploma. The WDE expects the graduation rates to show a slight decrease over the next few years due to this new requirement.

The WDE and stakeholder group set the six-year targets based on the last six years of trend data and took into consideration the graduation requirements that go into effect 2005-2006.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 48.0% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 48.5% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 49.0% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 49.0% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 49.5% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 50.0% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 50.5% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 51.0% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Recruit and retain highly qualified special education staff to work with diverse student populations | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division National Personnel Center Projects Wyoming Diversity Task Force University of Wyoming NASDSE NCCREST |
| 2. Provide professional development opportunities | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Wyoming Diversity Task Force |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| designed to enhance skills of personnel working with diverse student populations | | | | | | | | | Cambium Learning / Sopris West Educational Services National Personnel Center Projects Northern Rockies Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired WY Deaf-Blind Project School Improvement Conference Leadership Symposium NWREL TAESE/MPRRC IRIS Center for Faculty Enhancement NPDCI Center for Improving Teacher Quality (CCSSO) |
| 3. Implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) statewide | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE LEAs University of Oregon - Center for PBIS PBIS State Leadership Team |
| 4. Identify and provide other targeted assistance in line with identified needs of districts around meeting AYP | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs, School Improvement, and Federal Programs Divisions NWREL Center on Instruction RRFC What Works Clearinghouse NCEA NICHCY |
| 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 | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Wyoming Transition Council National Post School Outcomes Center MPRRC/TAESE National Dropout Prevention Center NSTTAC |
| 6. Apply for the next cycle of State Personnel Development Grants | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division University of Wyoming MPRRC |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| (SPDG), focused on implementing a statewide PBIS initiative | | | | | | | | | NWREL |
| 7. Analyze the graduation rates after the implementation of the new graduation standards | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Data and Special Education Divisions Wyoming Transition Council State Advisory Panel NPSO NSTTAC NIUSI |
| 8. Evaluation initial PBIS initiative and review the state plan and modify procedures for statewide implementation if necessary | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE University of Oregon - Center for PBIS PBIS State Leadership Team |
| 9. Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | TAESE/MPRRC IRIS CEC WDE EIEP |
| 10. Secondary Redesign Project | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | NWREL Lawrence Picus & Associates WDE WEA NPSO Center NSTTAC NIRN NPSO |
| 11. Project Eye to Eye | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | Project Eye to Eye staff WDE Community Colleges LEAs Middle & High Schools Wyoming Transition Council PIC Part |

Monitoring Priority: 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: Wyoming uses the same dropout data used in the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). The dropout rates are calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics’ (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Wyoming’s annual dropout rate is calculated by taking one year's dropout counts from grades 9-12, divided by an average enrollment using October 1 enrollments and completer figures. The denominator is half the sum of the following: student count for grades 9-12 of the previous school year, the student count for grades 10-12 of the current year, completers for the current year and dropouts for the current year. The assumption of the denominator is that the sum of each of the four elements captures each student in a two-year period twice. Therefore, dividing by two ensures there are no duplicate counts. The numerator is the number of dropouts for the current year.

The current dropout/graduation formulas exclude students that have been verified as transferring out of the district. The formulas include students that transfer into the district and complete or dropout as indicated in the formula.

The dropout formula is:

$$\frac{2004-2005 \text{ Dropouts Grades 9-12}}{([9-12 \text{ enrollment}_{\text{Oct 1, 2004}}] + [10-12 \text{ enrollment}_{\text{Oct 1, 2005}}] + [\text{Completers}_{2004-2005}] + [9-12 \text{ Dropouts}_{2004-2005}]) / 2}$$

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2004-2005):

Comparison of Dropout Rates

| School Year | Overall Dropout Rates | Overall Number of Dropouts | Dropout Rates for Students with Disabilities | Number of Dropouts for Students with Disabilities |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| 1999-2000 | 5.69 | 1,717 | 13.6 | 419 |
| 2000-2001 | 6.27 | 1,854 | 15.9 | 508 |
| 2001-2002 | 5.87 | 1,633 | 16.7 | 534 |
| 2002-2003 | 4.62 | 1,274 | 14.5 | 462 |

| | | | | |
|-----------|------|-------|------|-----|
| 2003-2004 | 4.49 | 1,216 | 14.2 | 463 |
| 2004-2005 | 4.75 | 1,269 | 14.2 | 454 |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Trend data indicates the dropout rate for students with disabilities is about three times that of students without disabilities. Both areas have shown decreases in the last three years and there is slight closure of the gap between the two. The State plans to continue closing the gap. The State is concerned, however, that if the graduation rate drops the next two years, the dropout rate may increase or show little improvement.

The dropout rate for students with disabilities is significantly higher than the rate for students without disabilities. Wyoming counts students that leave school to enroll in a GED program as dropouts.

The WDE and stakeholder group set the six-year targets based on the last six years of trend data and took into consideration the graduation requirements that go into effect 2005-2006.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 14.0% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 13.8% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 13.6% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 13.6% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 13.4% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 13.2% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 13.0% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 12.8% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities

that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Assist the WDE in addressing systemic graduation and dropout issues for students with disabilities | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | Wyoming Transition Council State Advisory Panel WDE Special Programs and Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Divisions WDE Strategic Plan / State Board of Education Northern Rockies Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired National Dropout Prevention Center NSTTAC |
| 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 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | PBIS/RTI State Leadership Teams WDE Cross Collaboration Teams Wyoming Transition Council MPRR/TAESE University of Wyoming Special Education Department RTI Task Force |
| 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 | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division WASEA State Advisory Panel Wyoming Transition Council NASDSE Project Forum Communities of Practice |
| 4. Collaborate with LEAs not meeting AYP and the Assessment and | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Standards, Assessment and Accountability Divisions |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accountability Divisions to ensure that Targeted Intervention Plans for dropout/graduation addresses unique needs of students with disabilities | | | | | | | | | Wyoming Transition Council NWREL |
| 5. Project Eye to Eye | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | Project Eye to Eye staff WDE Community Colleges LEAs Middle & High Schools Wyoming Transition Council PIC |
| 6. Continue activities involving low incidence populations to improve completion of secondary education and move into successful post secondary activities | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Wyoming Transition Council National Post School Outcome Center National Dropout Prevention Center National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center NIMAS/CAST NCDB |
| 7. Increase involvement of outreach consultants for Deaf and Hard of Hearing and Visually Impaired students in transition planning and activities | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Wyoming Transition Council MPRRRC NASDSE, Inc. |
| 8. Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | TAESE/MPRRRC IRIS CEC WDE EIEP |
| 9. Secondary School Redesign (SSR) | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | NWREL Lawrence Picus & Associates WDE WEA NPSO Center NSTTAC NIRN NPSO |

Monitoring Priority: Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of districts 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 = # of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts in the State times 100.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

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

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a.

C. Proficiency rate =

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

Overall Percent = $b + c + d + e$ divided by a.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Wyoming's state assessment system from 2000-2004 was known as the Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System (WyCAS). In compliance with federal and state regulations, all Wyoming students participated in the WyCAS in one of the following ways: WyCAS without accommodations, WyCAS with accommodations, or the WyCAS Alternate Assessment (WyCAS Alt). Students taking the WyCAS were enrolled in 4th, 8th, or 11th grade.

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, however, the WDE implemented a new assessment system called the Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS). All students enrolled in grades 3 – 8 and 11 are required to participate in the PAWS. Content areas of the 2005-2006 PAWS included reading, writing and mathematics with the addition of field test items in science to the system in 2006-2007.

Because teachers are often overwhelmed by being asked to promote student mastery of literally hundreds of curricular aims, PAWS assessment targets were conceptualized in the form of *important, teachable, and measurable skills* based on Wyoming's content standards. Accordingly, after a careful analysis of the State's content standards, a modest number of skills (eight in reading, two in writing, and twelve in mathematics) were derived directly from those state standards to constitute the heart of the PAWS accountability strategy. The State is committed to supplying Wyoming educators with guidelines and exemplars of formative assessments measuring students' attainment of the sub-skills and en route bodies of knowledge needed for students to master these twenty-two PAWS skills. Independent studies indicate that the PAWS skills align with state content standards.

PAWS tests were divided into two parts with one mission: improved instruction. The entire assessment approach embodied in PAWS is focused on getting more Wyoming students to master sets of powerful, high-priority skills in reading, mathematics, and writing derived from the state's content standards. By dividing each test into two subtests and permitting early administration of those subtests, PAWS assessments—originally designed to serve a summative function—can be employed for a formative, instructionally supportive purpose. Because tests that function formatively must provide information to teachers and/or students while there is still sufficient time to make meaningful adjustments either in a teacher's instructional activities or in a student's learning tactics, teachers can direct their students to complete one or more PAWS subtests in January. Results from those subtests will be available in ample time for students and teachers to make adjustments in how they pursue the curricular aims represented by the PAWS skills.

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are working toward Alternate Achievement Standards participate in the Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students – Alternate (PAWS-ALT), which was also introduced in the 2005-2006 school year. In preparation for the PAWS-ALT's inception, a diverse group of stakeholders successfully developed the new Wyoming Academic Content Standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. In compliance with federal guidelines outlined in NCLB, these standards are reduced in depth, breadth, and complexity, and are linked to grade level Wyoming Content and Performance Standards. The PAWS-ALT is a multiple measures assessment which assesses student knowledge and skills of these Academic Content Standards in reading, writing, mathematics and in science in the form of field test items in the 2006 – 2007 administration.

The PAWS-ALT reflects the same philosophy of providing students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of grade-level linked Academic Content Standards for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities. The PAWS-ALT is intended for the very small number of students

in Wyoming with the most significant cognitive disabilities (less than 1% of all Wyoming students). This assessment focuses on assessment targets used by Wyoming educators for instructional guidance as they teach this population. These targets specify a modest number of extremely important skills that the students in this population should be able to do. The targets also define the essential elements of the Academic Content Standards, thus simplifying their cognitive complexity, and provide for breadth of student access across varying levels of cognitive complexity.

In order to provide students with these multiple opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of the standards, the PAWS-ALT is comprised of three test components: 1) Student Performance Events (SPE): on-demand solicitations of student performance on determined Academic Content Standards; 2) direct Teacher Observation of Academic Skills (TOAS): observation and evaluation of the demonstration of academic skills during instruction; and 3) Data Collection of Student Work (DCSW) on a specified Academic Benchmark to which the teacher aligns the skill and which is assessed during instruction. These different components, therefore, present the student with a variety of avenues through which to demonstrate what he or she has learned in relation to the Academic Content Standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

In developing the state's new alternate assessment system, the WDE brought together stakeholders representing a broad cross section of Wyoming citizens during the spring and summer of 2005. The participants developed new grade-level linked, academic expanded standards and benchmarks in language arts, mathematics and science, which were subsequently renamed as Wyoming's Academic Content Standards. The Language Arts and Mathematics Academic Content Standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities were approved by the Wyoming State Board of Education in May 2006 and the Science Academic Content Standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in October 2006. Technical adequacy for Wyoming's PAWS-ALT was provided by Harcourt Assessment, Inc. to evaluate the assessment for Peer Review submission and to provide information to the Technical Advisory Committee for State Assessment Recommendations.

The state's previous alternate assessment system (WyCAS Alt) was primarily a portfolio aligned with Wyoming Content Standards and linked to Wyoming's Expanded Content Standards in the two areas of language arts and math. However, with the addition of more content areas and grade levels, the WDE Special Programs Division advocated for an alternate assessment that would provide reliable and valid data through a more diagnostically sound instrument. The WDE also sought to provide an assessment that would truly inform instruction, measure discrete growth and emphasize academic skills.

Harcourt and WDE staff provided regional trainings on the administration of the PAWS and PAWS-ALT during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. Results from the PAWS and PAWS-ALT have been collected, and annual data will be reported in each APR submitted by the state. The WDE collects PAWS data directly from Harcourt Assessment. Districts receive their data via INFORM through the Wyoming Education Gateway (WEEdGate) tool. Schools receive detailed score reports back from Harcourt Assessment within one month of testing in order to accommodate the dialogue necessary for improving student academic outcomes.

District Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. 2004-2005 AYP Results

| | % 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) |
| Grade 4 | 62.5% | 5/8 | 62.5% | 5/8 |
| Grade 8 | 33.3% | 3/9 | 44.4% | 4/9 |
| Grade 11 | 33.3% | 1/3 | 0% | 0/3 |

*There are 48 school districts that serve grades K-8 and 46 districts that serve grades 9-11.

**The denominator in this category represents the number of districts who meet the subgroup “n” requirement of 30 students. Not all 48 districts meet this requirement.

B. Participation Rates on State Assessments among Students with Disabilities

| Indicator 3 Measurement B part: | 2004-05 IEP Assessment PARTICIPATION | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Subject | Reading | | | Math | | |
| | Grade | 4 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 11 |
| | Exempt | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| | Not Tested | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| B # | Tested Regular Assessment Without Accommodations | 172 | 174 | 119 | 172 | 174 | 118 |
| C # | Tested Regular Assessment With Accommodations | 644 | 717 | 438 | 644 | 717 | 438 |
| D # | Tested Alternate Assessment at Grade Level Standards | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E # | Tested Alternate Assessment at Alternate Standards | 60 | 65 | 48 | 61 | 65 | 48 |
| (b+c+d+e) # | TOTAL Tested | 876 | 956 | 605 | 877 | 956 | 604 |
| A # | TOTAL Tested + Not Tested + Exempt | 884 | 966 | 612 | 884 | 966 | 612 |
| b / a % | Tested Regular Assessment Without Accommodations | 19.5% | 18.0% | 19.4% | 19.5% | 18.0% | 19.3% |
| c / a % | Tested Regular Assessment With Accommodations | 72.9% | 74.2% | 71.6% | 72.9% | 74.2% | 71.6% |
| d / a % | Tested Alternate Assessment at Grade Level Standards | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| e / a % | Tested Alternate Assessment at Alternate Standards | 6.8% | 6.7% | 7.8% | 6.9% | 6.7% | 7.8% |
| (b+c+d+e) / a % | Participation Rate - Overall IEP % | 99.1% | 99.0% | 98.9% | 99.2% | 99.0% | 98.7% |

C. Proficiency Rates on State Assessments among Students with Disabilities

| Indicator 3 Measurement C part: | 2004-05 Students with Disability Statewide Assessment PROFICIENCY | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------|------|-------|-------|------|------|
| | Subject | Reading | | | Math | | |
| | Grade | 4 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 11 |
| B # | Tested PROFICIENT Regular Assessment Without Accommodations | 44 | 19 | 16 | 47 | 20 | 13 |
| C # | Tested PROFICIENT Regular Assessment With Accommodations | 52 | 43 | 23 | 101 | 24 | 16 |
| D # | Tested PROFICIENT Alternate Assessment at Grade Level Standards | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E # | Tested PROFICIENT Alternate Assessment at Alternate Standards | 35 | 30 | 25 | 30 | 33 | 22 |
| (b+c+d+e) # | TOTAL "n" Tested PROFICIENT or ABOVE | 131 | 92 | 64 | 178 | 77 | 51 |
| A # | TOTAL Tested Proficient or Non-Proficient | 884 | 966 | 612 | 884 | 966 | 612 |
| (b+c+d+e) / a % | TOTAL % Tested Proficient or Above | 14.8% | 9.5% | 10.5% | 20.1% | 8.0% | 8.3% |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A. Districts Meeting AYP

In Wyoming there are 48 school districts that serve grades K-8 and 46 districts that serve grades 9-11. As reported in the baseline data, depending on the district and grade reported for accountability purpose the number of districts that met AYP in 2004-2005 varies from three to eight districts. In 2004-2005, eight districts serving 4th graders met the minimum "n" of 30 students and five of those districts met AYP in language arts and math. In 2004-2005, nine districts serving 8th graders met the minimum "n" of 30 students; three districts met AYP in language arts and four districts met AYP in math. Finally, in 2004-2005, three districts serving 11th graders met the minimum "n" of 30 students; one district met AYP in language arts and no district met AYP in math.

For accountability decisions, the minimum number of students is set at 30. This minimum sample size assures that reliable and valid decisions are made about school and LEA effectiveness. Subgroup results with fewer than 30 students in the assessed grade level are not included in AYP calculations based on the performance of that particular subgroup. The members of the subgroup are included in the AYP calculations for the entire school and LEA. This definition of subgroup size of 30 is used consistently across the state for accountability purposes.

B. Participation Rates on State Assessments among Students with Disabilities

The assessment participation rate of Wyoming students with disabilities is greater than 99% in all three grades tested in 2004-2005.

The WDE goal is to have 100% participation rate in statewide assessments. Circumstances beyond the educational control of the school/LEA should not unnecessarily degrade the related participation rate.

Therefore, students that have not participated in the state assessment due to expulsion or medical emergencies are not used in the calculation of school or LEA participation rate.

Any school/LEA falling below a 95% participation rate for its SWD subgroup will receive specialized attention and technical assistance from the WDE Special Education Unit. This 95% threshold has been established in order to match participation rate requirements set forth in NCLB.

C. Proficiency Rates on State Assessments among Students with Disabilities

Trend data for language arts proficiency rates for students with disabilities indicates a slight decrease in all three grades assessed. In 2004-2005, 15% of 4th graders, 10% of 8th graders and 11% of 11th graders scored proficient or higher on the regular assessment.

Trend data for math proficiency rates for students with disabilities indicate a slight improvement in all three grades assessed. In 2004-2005, 20% of 4th graders, 8% of 8th graders and 8% of 11th graders scored proficient or higher on the regular assessment.

While proficiency rates are not as high as comparison cohorts, the PAWS and PAWS-ALT will provide multiple opportunities for student assessment, and Wyoming expects the proficiency rates to improve.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets

A. Districts Meeting AYP

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>2005 (2005-2006)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 65%, Middle – 35%, High – 35% Math Elementary – 65%, Middle – 45%, High – 10%</p> |
| <p>2006 (2006-2007)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 69%, Middle – 43%, High – 43% Math Elementary – 69%, Middle – 51%, High – 20%</p> |
| <p>2007 (2007-2008)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 74%, Middle – 50%, High – 50% Math Elementary – 74%, Middle – 57%, High – 30%</p> |
| <p>2008 (2008-2009)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 78%, Middle – 57%, High – 57% Math Elementary – 78%, Middle – 63%, High – 40%</p> |
| <p>2009 (2009-2010)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 82%, Middle – 64%, High – 64% Math Elementary – 82%, Middle – 69%, High – 50%</p> |
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 86%, Middle – 71%, High – 71% Math Elementary – 86%, Middle – 75%, High – 60%</p> |
| <p>2011 (2011-2012)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 90%, Middle – 78%, High – 78% Math Elementary – 90%, Middle – 81%, High – 70%</p> |
| <p>2012 (2012-2013)</p> | <p>Language Arts Elementary – 94%, Middle – 85%, High – 85% Math Elementary – 94%, Middle – 87%, High – 80%</p> |

B. Participation Rates on State Assessments among Students with Disabilities

| Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Participation in Reading and Math | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| FFY | Reading Participation | Math Participation |
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% participation | 100% participation |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% participation | 100% participation |

C. Proficiency in State Achievement Standards

| Proficiency Targets for Students with Disabilities | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| FFY | Reading Proficiency | | | Math Proficiency | | |
| | Elementary | Middle | High | Elementary | Middle | High |
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 42.00% | 45.42% | 57.00% | 36.50% | 37.75% | 46.50% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 42.00% | 45.42% | 57.00% | 36.50% | 37.75% | 46.50% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 42.00% | 45.42% | 57.00% | 36.50% | 37.75% | 46.50% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 53.60% | 56.33% | 65.60% | 49.20% | 50.20% | 57.20% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 53.60% | 56.33% | 65.60% | 49.20% | 50.20% | 57.20% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 53.60% | 56.33% | 65.60% | 49.20% | 50.20% | 57.20% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 65.20% | 67.25% | 74.20% | 61.90% | 62.65% | 67.90% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 76.80% | 78.17% | 82.80% | 74.60% | 75.10% | 78.60% |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities

that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Provide research-based strategies during statewide conferences and professional development opportunities for LEA staff to increase academic performance of students with disabilities | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Cambium Learning / Sopris West Teton Institute Leadership Symposium NCA School Improvement Conference WASEA WASPE Council for Exceptional Children |
| 2. Staff training in administering the PAWS and the PAWSALT | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Standards, Assessment and Accountability Divisions Harcourt Assessment Questar |
| 3. Implement the PAWS-ALT based on Wyoming Academic Content Standards | X | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs and Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Divisions Harcourt Assessment Wyoming Alt Assessment Task Force Questar |
| 4. Provide training and information on RTIRTI to schools who are not participating in the pilot program | | X | X | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division RTI Leadership Team Cambium Learning / Sopris West Teton Institute iSTEEP MPRR/TAESE NRCLD IRIS Center NIRN NWREL Center on Instruction |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | CCSSO |
| 5. Monitor/Analyze growth models in other states to determine usefulness to Wyoming | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Divisions |
| 6. Analyze PAWS and PAWSALT data to determine if assessment process (including accommodations and modifications) requires adjustment | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Divisions |
| 7. Establishment of a statewide procedure for agencies electing to use RTI as an identification strategy for special education | | | X | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division University of Wyoming Montana Office of Public Instruction University of Montana Wyoming Pilot Elementary Schools iSTEOP MPPRC/TAESE NRCLD IRIS Center NIRN NWREL Center on Instruction |
| 8. Identify successful model reading and math programs in districts meeting AYP for students with disabilities subgroup | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and School Improvement Divisions WASEA WAESP WASSP Wyoming Curriculum Directors Association RTI State Task Force |

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|--|

Indicator #4A: 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

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

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

- | |
|---|
| <p>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 # of districts in the State times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>Wyoming has defined significant discrepancy as any district that suspends or expels two or more students at a rate of 5% or more of its students with disabilities.</p> |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Wyoming districts report very few suspensions and expulsions. The low reporting frequency and small district populations make it difficult to interpret discrepancies among the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with disabilities and children without disabilities. The WDE currently collects data for this indicator annually from all 48 districts through the state-approved data collection system. This data is used to complete the OSEP Table 5, Section A, Columns 3A, 3B and 3C. Suspension and expulsion data for preschool students served in the state's CDCs are gathered in the same way, although Wyoming CDCs have stated policies prohibiting the suspension and/or expulsion of preschool students enrolled in their programs.

In the FFY 2003 APR, the WDE analyzed the data and compared suspension and expulsion rates between students with and without disabilities within each district. Data from all 48 Wyoming districts and all 14 developmental preschool regions revealed that only eight districts suspended or expelled a student with a disability. Each of those eight districts suspended or expelled one student; the remaining 40 districts and all 14 developmental preschool regions suspended or expelled zero students with a disability.

In conjunction with the annual data collection, the WDE special education monitoring process verifies the LEA suspension and expulsion rates and numbers. During the monitoring process, districts must provide discipline policies to guarantee that policies, procedures and practices are not discriminatory against students with disabilities.

After reviewing the APR letter and receiving input from the stakeholder group the WDE reevaluated the method used to determine significant discrepancy. The WDE will move from comparing suspension and expulsion rates between students with and without disabilities within the LEA to comparing suspension and expulsion rates among state LEAs.

The WDE has defined significant discrepancy as any district that suspends or expels two or more students and at a rate of 5% or more of its students with disabilities.

To determine significant discrepancy, the WDE will use the current data collection and monitoring methods. If the data indicates a district displays significant discrepancy, then the WDE will examine the district. The WDE will review district data and policies to identify potential areas of concern. Upon the completion of the internal evaluation, the district will complete a self-assessment of the data and

provide the WDE with as explanation of the discrepancy. WDE will work with the district to establish improvement strategies.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Districts Identified as having significant discrepancy

Suspensions / Expulsions (>10 days) of Students with Disabilities 2004-2005 by Wyoming District

| District | District Enrollment of Students with Disabilities | District Count of Students with Disabilities Suspended/Expelled | District Rate for Suspension/ Expulsion of Students with Disabilities |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | 836 | 3 | 0.36% |
| 2 | 403 | 5 | 1.24% |
| 3 | 106 | 1 | 0.94% |
| 4 | 1,578 | 8 | 0.51% |
| 5 | 1,614 | 2 | 0.12% |
| 6 | 61 | 1 | 1.64% |
| 7 | 387 | 1 | 0.26% |
| 8 | 70 | 1 | 1.43% |
| 9 | 645 | 1 | 0.16% |
| 10 | 231 | 1 | 0.43% |
| 11 | 150 | 1 | 0.67% |

Percent of the LEAs in Wyoming that had suspension and/or expulsion rates greater than 5% of their population of students with disabilities = **0%**

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A. Districts Identified as having significant discrepancy

During the 2004-2005 year, eleven school districts suspended or expelled 25 students with disabilities longer than 10 days. 37 Wyoming districts reported no suspensions of this length or expulsions for students with disabilities; 14 developmental preschool regions reported no suspensions or expulsions for students with disabilities. Overall, zero districts were identified as having significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities.

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, the State will require each of the 48 districts to report annually on this indicator through the stable self-assessment portion of the WDE monitoring system. Districts whose reported rates are higher than 5% are required to address the issue through a Corrective Action Plan detailing the policies and procedures the LEA will undertake in order to correct the significant discrepancy within one year.

Indicator 4A: Districts identified as having significant discrepancy

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 0% of districts with significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions & expulsions |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Analyze and determine districts with significant discrepancy for sub indicator A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division LEAs EIEP CDCs Data Driven Enterprises |
| 2. Review data from pilot districts implementing RTI and Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports for improvement in Suspension and Expulsion is evident | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division LEA Personnel RTI Task Force PBIS Task Force Data collections including SWIS |
| 3. Review discipline policies of districts monitored each year; conduct focused monitoring and identify technical assistance as needed | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP |
| 4. Refine the state definition and reporting procedure for in-school suspension | | X | X | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs, Data, and Health and Safety Divisions Data Quality Council Data Driven Enterprises |
| 5. Offer professional development to identify and provide supports for suspension and expulsion strategies to Wyoming educators through the Teton Institute, RTI and PBIS | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Cambium Learning / Sopris West Educational Services University of Wyoming MPRRRC/TAESE University of Oregon PBIS IRIS Center on Instruction NWREL |
| 6. Review and modify the monitoring process to ensure accuracy and consistency in methodology that LEAs report suspensions and expulsions | | X | X | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs, Data, and Health and Safety Divisions CDT Unit Data Driven Enterprises |
| 7. Examine impact of in-school suspension on significant discrepancy, provide technical assistance through focused monitoring and adjust targets as necessary | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division LEA Personnel RTI Task Force PBIS Task Force EIEP |
| 8. Develop common definitions of suspension and expulsion for CDCs in accordance with OSEP guidance | | | X | | | | | | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division ECO NECTAC |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. Review CDC discipline policies and procedures; provide technical assistance as needed | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE |
| 10. Participate in WDE Data Quality Council in order to revise the state’s data dictionary and create standard reporting definitions | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division WDE Data Quality Council |

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator #4B: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The WDE uses the “state bar” method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY2010 state rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than 10 days is .57%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.57% or more of its students with disabilities for more than 10 days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be at least 25 students in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged.

Data Source: Data for collecting and reporting under section 618.

Display 4B-1: Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data):

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------|---|
| 2009 | 0% of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions & expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. |
| 2010 | 0% of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions & expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2011 | 0% of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions & expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. |
| 2012 | 0% of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions & expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. |

Display 4B-2: Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2008-09 data):

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Total # of LEAs | 48 |
| # of LEAs determined to have numerical significant discrepancy | 0 |
| % of LEAs determined to have numerical significant discrepancy | 0.0% |
| # of LEAs found to have significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures | 0 |
| Percent of LEAs that had significant discrepancy due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures | 0.0% |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For indicator 4B, 48 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 48 LEAs, none met the minimum requirements of suspending/expelling at least 10 students in the target group and the comparison group. Please note that there were a total of 86 students who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in the entire state of Wyoming in 2008 – 2009. Thus, most LEAs have only 0-2 students of a given racial/ethnic group that were suspended for more than 10 days. As such, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. Furthermore, the LEAs, by suspending/expelling so few students with disabilities, are doing what they have been trained to do, and that is to find more student-centered ways of dealing with behavioral issues than suspensions and expulsions.

Display 4B-3: LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

| Year | Total Number of LEAs | Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity | Percent |
|--|----------------------|---|---------|
| FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 48 | 0 | 0% |

Display 4B-4: LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

| Year | Total Number of LEAs | Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. | Percent |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|---------|
| FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 48 | 0 | 0% |

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2009 using 2008-2009 data): *If any LEAs are identified with significant discrepancies:*

Because Wyoming is reporting that none of its forty-eight LEAs have a significant discrepancy in suspensions or expulsions of more than 10 days in a school year by race or ethnicity, WDE has not reviewed its policies, procedures and practices relating to discipline of children with disabilities for the FFY 2009 APR submission. If the State has an increase in the number of districts with significant discrepancies in this area, it will then complete a review of policies, procedures and practices and submit it in the subsequent year’s APR.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | |
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| <p><i>Design an integrated professional development and technical assistance system which supports school improvement efforts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives from the Special Programs Division are part of the team that oversees the Statewide System of Support providing targeted technical assistance to school districts across | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division NWRCC NPDCI University of Oregon PBIS RTI/IRIS Center Center on Instruction |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Wyoming in accordance with 20 U.S.C.A. §6301-6578 of the ESEA.</p> <p>The WDE provides direct support and technical assistance to districts and individual schools to help them build capacity for meaningful change that will improve academic outcomes.</p> | | | | | |
| <p><i>Annually conduct a workshop for building administrators on discipline policy implementation at various state level meetings.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3rd Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium provided technical assistance to support school improvement efforts on reducing expulsion and suspension. • The Wyoming State Legislature passed a bullying statute and required districts to have policies in place by December 2009. | X | X | X | X | <p>WDE Special Programs Division</p> <p>WDE Health and Safety Division</p> <p>Contract consultants</p> |

Monitoring Priority: 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Placement data indicates that the percent of students with disabilities in category categories A and B is stable. While the numbers have not changed significantly over the past three years, Wyoming's percent of students with disabilities who are removed from the regular classroom less than 21% of the day is higher than the national average. WDE has set targets to ensure that decisions made will continue to meet the needs of the individual child.

One area of concern is the placement of students with disabilities outside of their local district. These placements are often court-ordered. Students may be placed in residential treatment facilities because of violations of the law, need for specialized mental or psychological treatment, or because no other viable placement is available. The WDE has one consultant working in collaboration with other state agencies to ensure that all students are placed appropriately and in the least restrictive environment. The Wyoming legislature funded a study to examine this issue and the implications involved in placing students outside of their residential district. In response to the APR letter, the WDE found that the number of students with IEPs in residential facilities varies widely from month to month in but remains in the range of 45-70 percent of the facility population. The WDE will continue to evaluate information from the legislative study regarding students with IEPs reported receiving services in private separate schools, home schools or homebound settings. The WDE has established a method to gather data on a monthly basis from the residential facilities, including the number of students in court-ordered placement and on IEPs.

With the new NCLB requirements for highly qualified special education teachers, the number of children receiving services in the regular classroom may increase in 2006-2007 due to a potential shortage of highly qualified special education teachers who might otherwise provide instruction in settings outside the regular classroom.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

| | <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 |
|------------|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 2004 -2005 | 55.81% | 6,493 | 9.59% | 1,115 | 2.47% | 289 |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The number of students placed outside of the regular classroom less than 21% of the time remains stable over a five-year period. The number of students placed outside of the classroom more than 60% of the time has also remained relatively stable over the same period. More than half of all students with disabilities spend less than 21% of the time out of the regular classroom.

WDE believes that the number of students reported in separate facilities may be unreliable because of inconsistent tracking systems between public and private schools, including residential treatment centers, juvenile detention centers and adult correctional facilities. WDE is aware of this disconnect and is developing a process to better monitor placement of students.

The WDE set targets by reviewing five-year trend data and gathering stakeholder input.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Measurement A <21% | Measurement B >60% | Measurement C Separate % |
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 56.00% | 9.55% | 2.46% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 57.00% | 9.52% | 2.45% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 57.30% | 9.48% | 2.44% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 57.40% | 9.44% | 2.43% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 57.50% | 9.39% | 2.42% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 58.00% | 9.30% | 2.41% |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 58.50% | 9.28% | 2.40% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 60.00% | 9.25% | 2.39% |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 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 | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs, CDT Division WDE staff involved with Court-Ordered Placed Students (COPS) Staff from public and private institutions BOCES |
| 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 and PBIS | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Cambium Learning / Sopris West Educational Services University of Wyoming MPRRC/TAESE NWREL NPDCI University of Oregon PBIS WY School Improvement Conference WY Mentorship Academy What Works Clearinghouse |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 3. Develop a method to improve tracking of students with IEPs in separate school settings | | | X | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions Data Driven Enterprises |
| 4. Evaluate targets for combined separate facilities and adjust if necessary | | | | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions |
| 5. Continue cross-unit collaboration toward overall school improvement activities | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE (all Divisions) |
| 6. Utilize specially-trained consultants to assist in education program planning and staff training related to young children with low-incidence disabilities | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division PIC NASDSE CAST NICHCY FCTD NCDB |
| 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 | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division staff and contractors MPRRRC/TAESE |
| 8. Annual Special Education Leadership Symposium | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | TAESE/MPRRC NWREL IRIS Center CEC WDE EIEP |

Monitoring Priority: Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator #6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Use 618 data – sampling not allowed

Measurement: Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This data is collected from the 14 Developmental Preschool regions through the EIEP preschool database, and is based upon the December 1 Child Count Collection and is sent to WDE for use in federal reporting. In order to determine the percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers, the EIEP combined the number of children in the Early Childhood Setting, Home, and Part-Time Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education Setting and divided that number by the total number of children with IEPs.

Historically, the Developmental Preschool regions have received many definitions for LRE which vary from program to program. Recognizing the need for timely and accurate data, WDE and EIEP have acknowledged the need for clear and concise definitions of LRE so that the Developmental Preschool regions can all adhere to the same placement settings; guidance documents and training will be provided to all Developmental Preschool regions.

Baseline Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Baseline data will be reported on the State Performance Plan due February 1, 2009. The definition of the environment settings changed; it will take a year to modify definitions, train staff of data element definitions and collect baseline data.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The WDE will set targets based on FFY 2007 baseline data.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | N/A |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | N/A |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| 2007 (2007-2008) | TBD |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | TBD |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | TBD |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | TBD |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | TBD |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | TBD |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Continue to track data regionally recognizing variability due to local issues | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP Preschool Database WESTAT MPRRC/TAESE Data Driven Enterprises |
| 2. Provide Information, training and follow up training to regions regarding continuum of service settings through compressed video and DDD Annual Conference | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP MPRRC/TAESE |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>3. Work with regions not meeting LRE requirements to identify barriers to more inclusive settings</p> | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | <p>WDE Special Programs Division EIEP NECTAC NCSEAM MPRRC Other state coordinators NPDCI</p> |
| <p>4. Modify the mechanism for collecting preschool LRE data to reflect the notification of TA provided via email from OSEP on 11/29/06 and posted on www.ideadata.org</p> | | | X | | | | | | <p>EIEP WDE Special Programs Division</p> |
| <p>5. Improve collaboration for transition of 5 year-olds from preschool to kindergarten</p> | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | <p>EIEP WASEA WAESP MPRRC/TAESE CDS staff members WDE Early Childhood Taskforce</p> |

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator –7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to

same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2007 2007 - 2008 | TBD |

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The EIEP and WDE require that regional Preschool Development Centers use one or more of the following assessments annually to track child progress with respect to positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- *Battelle Developmental Inventory,*
- *BRIGANCE Inventory of Early Development–II (IED–II),*
- *The Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum for Ages 3-5 or,*

- Other tools approved by DDD.

The EIEP requests that the IEP team implement one or more of the above tools at the time of the child’s entry into the program and shortly before the child exits the program (three months prior or less). The IEP team also reviews other sources of information, including the Multidisciplinary Team Evaluation, the IEP objectives and outcomes, child observations and parent input in order to complete the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) for each child. This form is intended to summarize multiple sources of information as a method to report progress in the three developmental areas.

CDC staff members were given training on the COSF in January 2006, in August 2006, and in August 2007. They also received copies of an FAQ document that included instructions on how to complete the COSF and typical questions they might have about completing the form and collecting the data. The FAQ followed the best practices advocated by the ECO Center. In addition, NECTAC met with the EIEP staff members in March 2006 to provide in-depth training on summarizing and reporting out on the COSFs. Lastly, the EIEP staff members provided individual consultations to the CDCs via email and phone.

The COSF was completed for each child entering the program starting January 15, 2006 through June 30, 2006. CDCs submitted the completed COSFs to the EIEP on a quarterly basis as indicated in the table below. For the initial data collection period, COSFs were collected from only two quarters. After this initial year, COSF results will be based on four quarters of data collection (July through June).

| Quarter | Data Collection | Submit to the EIEP |
|---------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | January through March | April 15 |
| 2 | April through June | July 15 |
| 3 | July through September | October 15 |
| 4 | October through December | January 15 |

In 2007-08, an online COSF was implemented. This has allowed for the COSF to be completed in real-time and for efficient data collection and analysis processes. Both entry and exit data are collected using the online form. EIEP contracted with Data Driven Enterprises (DDE) for assistance with the data collection, data analysis, and report-writing for this indicator.

Measurement Processes

Starting with the February 2008 APR, EIEP had to be able to provide data in the official five reporting categories. EIEP uses the COSF to do this. For any child with entry data and who has been in the program for at least six months, the CDCs are required to collect exit data on this child and report it on the COSF. Exit data was collected for FFY 2006 and FFY 2007. The same procedures used to complete the COSF at entry (e.g., using multiple data sources, using a state-approved assessment, gathering input from the IFSP team, assigning a rating on the COSF) are used at exit. This allows EIEP to compare exit to entry scores on each of the three developmental areas.

As with FFY 2005, in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007, to ensure that the data reported on the COSF are reliable and valid, the EIEP examined the supporting documentation on the COSF and how it corresponded with the outcomes rating given the child. Documents showing the description of a child’s skills on each outcomes area and the child’s corresponding rating for the each outcomes area were produced. These documents were organized by child age. Thus, EIEP staff members could review the “typical” skills reported, for example, for a child who received a score of 4 on Social-Emotional at age 1.5 years. This

information will be shared with the regions so that the reliability of the scoring process across regions is increased.

In FFY 2006, the decision tree was incorporated on to the COSF. An analysis was conducted to determine if CDC personnel were accurately assigning overall ratings given the decision tree ratings. This analysis showed an accuracy rating of about 67%. While this accuracy rating might seem low, in the August 2007 training session, it was determined that some CDCs did not understand the relationship of the decision tree to the overall rating; this was clarified during training. Furthermore, some CDC staff members left the decision tree questions blank; once again, this was clarified during training. The important thing is that the EIEP continues to provide training on the COSF, continues to improve upon the COSF, and continues to analyze reliability and validity statistics to make sure the process in Wyoming is a valid one.

Additional changes for 2007-08, based on the analysis of FFY 2006 ratings include an online version of the COSF. Both of these changes will allow for more efficient tracking of children’s entry and exit ratings. Furthermore, the online version of the COSF directly ties the decision tree to the overall ratings; this has ensured that the overall assignment of ratings exactly matches the supporting documentation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Because this is a new Indicator, the EIEP collected only status data at entry data during FFY 2005.

Display 7-1: Number of Children Evaluated and Percentage of Children Scoring Below and at Age Level at Entry to the CDC Based on COSFs Collected January 2006 – June 2006

| Outcomes Area | Number Children | Percent Below Age-Level | Percent At Age-Level |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Positive Socio-Emotional Skills | 345 | 77% n=(266) | 23% n=(79) |
| Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | 345 | 77% n=(266) | 23% n=(79) |
| Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | 345 | 67% (n=232) | 33% (n=113) |

EIEP will collect the exit data during the 2006-2007 school year.

Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY2005:

In July 2006, the 345 COSFs that were completed between January 2006 and June 2006 were analyzed. The table above shows the percentage of children whose functioning was described as “comparable to same-aged peers.” This corresponds to a rating of 6 or 7 on the COSF.

To ensure that the data reported on the COSF are reliable and valid, the EIEP examined the supporting documentation on the COSF and how it corresponded with the outcomes rating given the child. In addition, during the August 2006 training session, CDC staff members were asked about the procedures they used in collecting the assessment data and completing the COSF. Any misconceptions were addressed in the updated FAQ document that was posted to the EIEP website and will be updated as new questions arise.

Furthermore, as a result of examining the relationship between the supporting documentation and the outcomes rating and of hearing the misconceptions of certain CDC members, the EIEP revised the COSF. The revisions will help guide the IEP teams in what type of supporting information they are supposed to provide on the COSF and how the type of supporting documentation relates to the 7-point COSF rating

scale. The EIEP also incorporated the ECO Center Decision Tree right onto the COSF to ensure that the different CDCs were applying the COSF decision rules consistently. See Attachment 3 for a copy of the revised form.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2006-2007):

The EIEP again collected status data at entry during FFY 2006 and also began collecting exit data.

In July 2007, the 841 COSFs that were completed between July 2006 and June 2007 were analyzed. Displays 7-2 and 7-3 show the percentage of children who’s functioning was described as “comparable to same-aged peers.” This corresponds to a rating of 6 or 7 on the COSF.

Display 7-4 indicates the percentage of children who improved their functioning between entry and exit. These data indicate that 96.1% improved or maintained functioning in social-emotional, 96.1% improved or maintained functioning in acquiring knowledge and skills, and 90.2% improved or maintained functioning in taking appropriate action.

Display 7-2: Number of Children Evaluated and Percentage of Children Scoring Below and at Age Level at Entry to the CDC Based on COSFs Collected July 2006 – June 2007

| Outcomes Area | Number Children | Percent Below Age-Level | Percent At Age-Level |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Positive Socio-Emotional Skills | 841 | 71.1% n=(512) | 28.9% n=(243) |
| Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | 841 | 69.6% n=(585) | 30.4% n=(256) |
| Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | 841 | 60.9% (n=598) | 39.1% (n=329) |

Display 7-3: Number of Children Evaluated and Percentage of Children Scoring Below and at Age Level at Exit to the CDC Based on COSFs Collected July 2006 – June 2007

| Outcomes Area | Number Children | Percent Below Age-Level | Percent At Age-Level |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Positive Socio-Emotional Skills | 252 | 47.6% n=(120) | 52.4% n=(132) |
| Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | 252 | 46.4% n=(117) | 53.6% n=(135) |
| Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | 252 | 38.5% (n=98) | 61.5% (n=154) |

Display 7-4: Percentage of Part B 619 children falling in each of five OSEP Improvement Categories

| OSEP Improvement Category | Social-Emotional | Knowledge and Skills | Taking Appropriate Action |
|---|------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Number of Children | 51 | 51 | 51 |
| e - Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 27.5% | 25.5% | 31.4% |
| d - Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 29.4% | 21.6% | 27.5% |

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| c - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 25.5% | 29.4% | 15.7% |
| b - Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers | 13.7% | 19.6% | 15.7% |
| a – Children who did not improve functioning | 3.9% | 3.9% | 9.8% |

Concrete explanation of improvement categories:

e = Child scored a 6 or 7 both times

d = Child scored below a 6 at Time 1 and a 6 or 7 at Time 2

c = Child scored higher at Time 2 than at Time 1, but Time 2 score is not a 6 or 7

b = Child scored the same at Time 2 and Time 1 (but not a 6 or 7); OR child scored lower at Time 2 than at Time 1 but the child made progress

a = Child scored lower at Time 2 than at Time 1 and the child made no progress; OR child scored a 1 at both times

Baseline Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

The WYDH again collected status data at entry and exit during FFY 2007. Display 7-5 shows the percentage of children scoring at age level at entry to the developmental preschool. As can be seen, this has remained fairly stable over time.

Display 7-5: Percentage of Part B Children Scoring at Age Level at Entry to the Developmental Preschool

| Outcomes Area | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Number of Children</i> | 345 | 841 | 890 |
| Positive Socio-Emotional Skills | 23% | 28% | 30% |
| Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | 23% | 30% | 33% |
| Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | 33% | 39% | 43% |

COSFs on children exiting in FY08 were analyzed. The following display indicates that children who are exiting Part B are more likely to have age-appropriate skills than those who enter Part B.

Display 7-6: Percentage of Part B Children Scoring at Age Level at Exit from the Developmental Preschool in FY 08

| Outcomes Area | Exiting Part B |
|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Number of children</i> | 523 |
| Positive Socio-Emotional Skills | 55% |
| Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | 59% |
| Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | 66% |

The matched group analysis is based only on those students who had a score at entry in either 2005-06 or in 2006-07 and had an exit score in 2007-08. These results are presented in Display 7-7. The results

show that for children exiting Part B, between 60-71% are exiting with age-appropriate skills. This clearly demonstrates the positive effects the Part B program had upon child outcomes. Furthermore, these data indicate that 99 - 100% of children exiting Part B improved or maintained functioning in the three areas. (Note: Results from 2006-07 are not included due to small numbers in 2006-07.)

Display 7-7: Percentage of Exiting Part B Children Included in Each of the Five OSEP Improvement Categories

| | Social-Emotional | Knowledge and Skills | Taking Appropriate Action |
|--|------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Number of Children</i> | 293 | 295 | 286 |
| e - Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 23% | 27% | 38% |
| d - Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 37% | 38% | 33% |
| c - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 20% | 15% | 13% |
| b - Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers | 19% | 19% | 16% |
| a - Children who did not improve functioning | 1% | 0% | 0% |

Concrete explanation of improvement categories:

e = Child scored a 6 or 7 both times

d = Child scored below a 6 at Time 1 and a 6 or 7 at Time 2

c = Child scored higher at Time 2 than at Time 1, but Time 2 score is not a 6 or 7

b = Child scored the same at Time 2 and Time 1 (but not a 6 or 7); OR child scored lower at Time 2 than at Time 1 but the child made progress

a = Child scored lower at Time 2 than at Time 1 and the child made no progress; OR child scored a 1 at both times

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

The EIEP proposed targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 on the FFY 2008 SPP. This year, the EIEP proposes to add the following targets for each outcomes area and each summary statement for FFY 2011 and FFY2012.

Display 7-8: Targets

| | Positive Social-Emotional Skills | | | |
|--|--|---------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited. | 60.68% | 61.18% | 62.18% | 63.18% |
| 2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited. | 56.87% | 57.37% | 58.37% | 59.37% |
| | Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | | | |
| FFY | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited. | 61.12% | 61.62% | 62.62% | 63.62% |
| 2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited. | 54.77% | 55.27% | 56.27% | 57.27% |
| | Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | | | |
| FFY | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited. | 63.81% | 64.31% | 65.31% | 66.31% |
| 2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited. | 67.05% | 67.55% | 68.55% | 69.55% |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | Resources |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | |
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Regional TA and training on State and Federal regulations relating to the provision of special education services | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division and contract consultants |
| 2. Track progress on targets via COSF. | X | X | X | X | EIEP Data Driven Enterprises |
| 3. Provide TA to regions that need to improve child outcomes | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division NECTAC ECO Center |
| 4. Provide online version of the COSF and assign unique identification numbers to preschool children | X | X | X | X | EIEP Data Driven Enterprises WDE Data Division |

| |
|---|
| 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)(3)(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. |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The WDE proposed using the University of Miami and National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) survey in its entirety to gather parent input. However, stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, parent group representatives and special education directors and staff, resisted. Reasons for resistance include the survey length, survey readability (higher than 8th grade) and relevance of some questions to the indicator. Based on the input from participants at three different meetings and stakeholder input, the WDE modified the survey to include the first subset of the survey “Schools’ Efforts to Partner with Parents” The WDE chose the first subset of the NCSEAM survey to maintain reliability and validity as well as consider the stakeholder input. The WDE contracted with the Wyoming Institute for Disabilities (WIND) to conduct the survey.

WIND selected a random sample of 10% of all parents of students with disabilities with over sampling in districts with low populations, high poverty rates, and/or regions of the state that traditionally have low survey return rates. WIND contacted school districts to obtain parent contact information and associated each parent with a unique identification number. Office staff who gathered parent contact information were not involved in gathering, analyzing, or reporting the data. Therefore, parent anonymity was completely protected and maintained.

As a methodological test of parent willingness to respond to a lengthier survey, every fourth identification number was selected to receive the survey in its entirety. To adjust for over-sampling in some districts, scores were weighted based upon district representation in the overall special education population.

The WDE and WIND were concerned about the possibility of low response rates from the outset of the project and took a number of steps to increase those rates. Parents were sent a notification postcard, letting them know they were selected to receive and were strongly encouraged to complete an important survey. A dollar bill was also included with each survey to increase parent motivation to return it. Reminder postcards were sent to the entire sample, and a second reminder postcard was sent to the entire sample one month later. A third and final reminder postcard went out to parents one month after that.

WIND also provided a number of different methods through which parents could respond to the survey. In addition to the printed copy, WIND collaborated with the Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center (WYSAC) to provide a toll-free number so respondents could respond via telephone—even during evenings and weekends. For Spanish speaking respondents, WIND provided a Spanish-speaking facilitator. Finally, a website was established for those who might prefer to answer the survey online.

After the surveys were collected and scored, WIND:

- completed a report of statewide baseline findings
- completed a summary report of findings by district
- completed more detailed reports by district for those districts being monitored
- completed a methodology report that includes recommendations for subsequent years

WDE will repeat the survey process every year of the SPP, and report annually in subsequent Annual Performance Reports.

After the surveys were collected and item results were calculated, the WDE and WIND decided that all 26 items on the short form of the survey related to the concept of the school facilitating parent involvement. Based on these 26 items, each survey respondent received a “sum total” score for the concept of “parent involvement” that indicated the total number of points a respondent “awarded” to the school. (Note: any respondent who left a question blank was assigned the average rating for that individual across all items rated. In this way, any missing value is an average of what the person rated other items.) A respondent who rated the school a “6” (Strongly Agree) on each of the 26 items received a sum total score of 156 (26 items times 6); a respondent who rated the school a “1” (Strongly Disagree) on each of the 26 items received a sum total score of 26. A respondent who rated the school a “4” (Agree) on each of the 26 items received a sum total score of 104.

After the item selection, the WDE and WIND decided where to set the cut-score for determining that the LEAs facilitated parent involvement. The WDE and WIND decided that a sum total score of 104 represented the most appropriate cut-score. A 104 cut-score would be representative of a parent who, on average, agrees with each of the 26 selected items and as such agrees that the school facilitated parent involvement.

At the end of the 2005-06 school year the WDE felt like in order to better align the analysis of this indicator with the state’s general supervision responsibilities we chose to change the vendor we were contracting with to perform the parent survey process. The WDE is currently contracting with Data Driven Enterprises for data collection and analysis of several components of our general supervision activities and this includes the parent survey. Included below is a description of the current process, including the sampling methodology, the WDE is using to gather the parent involvement information

During the 2006-07 school year, a total of 11,725 students with disabilities were being served in Wyoming public schools. In order to get the most valid results possible from a parent survey, a representative sample of the 11,725 students’ parents was chosen to be contacted. Specifically, a sample of 3,743 was selected. Mailing a survey to all parents was cost-prohibitive (in terms of direct mailing costs and personnel time for mailing and data entry).

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

| Number of Students | 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 age ensure representativeness of the resulting sample.

Thus, parents from each of the 48 Wyoming districts were mailed a survey. This allowed for each district to receive results on its parents and ensured the state results were in fact representative of the state as a whole. When calculating the state-level results, responses were weighted by the student population size (e.g., a district that has four times the number of students as another district received four times the weight in computing overall state results).

Surveying Parents of Preschoolers

The EIEP program stated in the FFY 2004 SPP that they would implement the Part B (619) parent survey once disseminated by NCSEAM. While the EIEP waited for the survey’s release, ongoing discussions were held with the Early Intervention Council regarding the development and status of the survey. Eventually, due to the tardiness of that survey’s arrival, EIEP and EIC developed its own Part B 619 Parent Survey (which was based on the short version of the NCSEAM Part B Preschool Survey for 5 year-olds). This survey was administered in each CDC between April and June 2006, and every survey was identifiable to an individual CDC. The EIEP contracted with Data Driven Enterprises (DDE) for assistance with the data collection, data analysis, and report writing for this indicator.

Survey data was collected from April 2006 through June 2006. The surveys were distributed in person by local CDC staff in conjunction with a face-to-face contact, such as an IEP meeting. CDC directors ensured that parents were provided with a private space to complete the survey and an envelope for them to seal their responses. At the stakeholders’ recommendation, assistance in completing the survey was provided to parents when necessary, and the survey was translated into Spanish. The EIEP provided CDCs with a written explanation describing the survey’s purpose, explaining how the results would be reported, and stating that no identifying information would be requested so that parent anonymity would be maintained. This explanation was distributed to parents by the CDCs.

Surveys were distributed to parents whose child had been enrolled in the CDC for at least six months. CDCs submitted the completed surveys to the EIEP on a quarterly basis as indicated in the table below. For the baseline data collection period, surveys were collected from only one quarter. After the baseline year, survey results will be based on four quarters of data collection (July through June).

| Quarter | Data Collection | Submit to EIEP |
|---------|--------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | January through March | April 15 |
| 2 | April through June | July 15 |
| 3 | July through September | October 15 |
| 4 | October through December | January 15 |

Between April 2006 and June 2006, 309 parent surveys were completed. A total of 2,061 children were receiving Part B 619 services as of December 1, 2005. Calculating a response rate based on 2,061 children gives a response rate of 18%. However, given that surveys were distributed at regularly-scheduled IEP meetings and that the surveys were collected for only a three-month period, this 18% response rate most likely represents an underestimate of the actual response rate since not all 2,061 parents had an opportunity to complete the parent survey in the three-month time period. Beginning with FFY 2006, all parents who have a child enrolled in the CDC for at least six months will be given the opportunity to complete the survey during any given twelve-month time period.

After the surveys were collected and item results were calculated, the Early Intervention Council members, CDC program directors, and EIEP staff members reviewed the survey items to determine which of the 33 items related to the concept of the preschool facilitating parent involvement. The 20 items in Section A of the survey were selected. These 20 items most closely match the items on the short form of the NCSEAM Part B Preschool Parent Survey.

Based on the item selections, each survey respondent received a “percent of maximum” score for the concept of “parent involvement” that indicated the percentage of points the respondent “awarded” to the preschool. 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.

After the item selection, this same stakeholder group decided where to set the cut-score for determining that the preschools facilitated parent involvement. The stakeholder group decided that an 80% cut-score represented the most appropriate cut-score. A 75% cut-score would be representative of a parent who, on average, agrees with each of the 20 selected items and as such agrees that the preschool facilitated parent involvement. Thus, an 80% cut-score represents a family who is slightly more positive than “agree,” i.e., the family has to have “strongly agreed” with at least one other item. The stakeholder group did not believe it was appropriate to insist that respondents “strongly agree” with each item (a cut-score of 100%) in order for the respondent to be counted as someone who believes that the preschool facilitated parent involvement. Thus, any parent who had a percent of maximum score of 80% or above was identified as one who reported that the preschool facilitated his/her involvement.

During FFY 2006, CDC staff members were asked about the procedures they used in collecting the family outcome data through completion of the Parent Survey. Additional analysis of the data received from the CDCs on the Family Survey lead the EIEP to identify problem areas on the form and the EIEP revised the Part B Parent Survey form. See the Appendix for a copy of the revised form.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Percentage of Parents who State that Schools Facilitated their Involvement:

| FFY | School facilitated parent involvement |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 50.85% |

Percentage of Parents who State that Preschools Facilitated their Involvement:

| FFY | Preschool facilitated parent involvement |
|---------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 70.2% |

Discussion of School Baseline Data:

This first year of data collection indicates that about half of parents believe that the schools facilitate their involvement: 50.85% of parents state that their child’s school facilitated their involvement.

While this overall “parent involvement” percentage provides a benchmark of the extent to which schools are encouraging and facilitating parent involvement, the Special Programs Division has also reviewed individual item results to determine specific areas in which the schools and the Special Programs Division can make improvements in how they communicate with and relate to parents of children with special needs. Districts will be given their survey results so that they might also target specific areas for improved parent involvement.

The Special Programs Division is concerned, however, about the low response rate of 27%. There were responses from all districts, but for five districts there was but a single respondent, four districts had just two respondents, and seven districts had only three respondents. Caution is warranted in making generalizations with these few respondents. Because certain districts were under-represented, responses were weighted by district to reflect their actual weight in the population of special education children served.

Discussion of Preschool Baseline Data

This first year of data collection indicates that the majority of parents believe that the preschools facilitate their involvement: 70% of parents state that their child’s preschool facilitated their involvement.

While this overall “parent involvement” percentage provides a benchmark of the extent to which preschools are encouraging and facilitating parent involvement, the EIEP has also reviewed individual item results to determine specific areas in which the preschools and the EIEP can make improvements in how they communicate with and relate to parents of children with special needs. CDCs will be given their survey results so that they might also target specific areas for improved parent involvement.

The WDE and EIEP are concerned, however, about the low response rate (18%) on this administration of the survey. Because the response rate was far below 100%, the demographic characteristics of the children of parents who responded were compared to the demographic characteristics of the 2,061 children receiving services as of December 1, 2005. The demographic characteristics based on current age of the child, the race/ethnicity of the child, the primary disability of the child, and the region to which the child is enrolled are very similar. For example:

- 30% of the December count children are 5 years old; 36% of the parents who completed a survey indicated that their child receiving services was 5 years old
- 84% of the December count children are white and 10% are Hispanic; 84% of the parents who completed a survey indicated that their child receiving services was white, and 7% of the parents who completed a survey indicated that their child receiving services was Hispanic

- 19% of the December count children have a primary disability of Developmental Disability; 14% of the parents who completed a survey indicated that their child has a primary disability of Developmental Disability
- 5% of the December count children are enrolled in Region 2 and 3% are enrolled in Region 4; 4% of the parents who completed a survey indicated that their child is enrolled in Region 2 and 2% indicated that their children are enrolled in Region 4.

Regions 7 and 10 were slightly overrepresented in the survey respondents, and Regions 3 and 5 were slightly under-represented. However, survey responses did not significantly differ by region (or by age of child, race, or primary disability), so weighting of results was not necessary.

The CDC directors have been urged to evaluate and refine their survey administration and collection methods to make sure they are as effective as possible. The WDE and EIEP are also confident that the response rate will improve when surveys are administered over the entire twelve-month period rather than the three-month window used to establish the State’s baseline data.

WDE Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Percentage of Parents who State that Schools Facilitate their Involvement:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 51.85% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 52.15% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 52.55% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 53.55% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 54.55% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 56.55% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 57.55% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 58.55% of parents reporting schools facilitate involvement |

Preschool Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Percentage of Parents who State that Preschools Facilitate their Involvement:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target, Preschool |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 70.2% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 70.7% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 71.2% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 72.7% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 73.2% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 75.2% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 75.7% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 76.2% of parents reporting preschools facilitate involvement |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Administer the parent survey to a statewide random sample of parents of children with disabilities | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Data Driven Enterprises LEAs |
| 2. Analyze survey results and establish baseline data, set targets and identify improvement activities | | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division Stakeholder group, including State Advisory Panel LEAs Data Driven Enterprises |
| 3. Provide statewide training on modified NCSEAM survey including follow up | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP MPPRC Child Development Services PIC NECTAC |
| 4. Analyze survey results and establish baseline data, set targets and identify improvement activities | | X | X | | | | | | EIEP PIC CDC Preschools Stakeholder group including State Advisory Panel WASEA |
| 5. Add completed parent survey tool to CDC contract requirement | | X | | | | | | | DDD Financial Manager |
| 6. Increase collaboration with the Parent Information Center (PIC) to provide assistance and information to parents as a result of needs identified through the administration of the parent survey | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP PIC UPLIFT WIND |
| 7. Annually review the survey results and add activities if systemic statewide parent issues are identified | | | | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Stakeholder group, including State Advisory Panel |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 8. Provide survey feedback to each district and CDC | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE EIEP Data Driven Enterprises |
| 9. Promote parent response to the Annual Parent Survey | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE EIEP Data Driven Enterprises |

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality |
|--|

Indicator #9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

| |
|---|
| <p>Measurement: Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.</p> |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Currently the Wyoming Department of Education collects this data through the state November 1 data collection report. The WDE reports child count and FAPE 618 data to OSEP. The WDE submits the data to the USOE clearinghouse each February and verifies the data for accuracy through LEA assurances and signatures. The WDE will use the 618 data to determine disproportionality.

Wyoming’s small homogeneous population makes determining disproportionate representation a challenge. The WDE reviews potential disproportionality as part of the special education monitoring process. In many Wyoming districts, even one student in a specific disability category will cause the data to appear disproportionate. During 2005-2006, WDE analyzed 618 data at the local and state levels. The state then determined a standard for disproportionate representation and applied it to the disaggregated 618 data. The WDE used the Alternate Risk Ratio as defined by OSEP/WESTAT for determining disproportionality because it is most relevant and meaningful for Wyoming’s rural population.

WDE Alternate Risk Ratio

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. Furthermore, it is impossible to calculate risk ratios if there are no students in the comparison group (i.e., the risk for the comparison group cannot be calculated) or if none of the students in the comparison group receives special education and related services either for the disability or in the educational environment (i.e., the risk for the comparison group is zero). For these reasons, the State opted to use the Alternate Risk Ratio when calculating disproportionality for this indicator.

The Alternate Risk Ratio provides for a more reliable indicator of disproportionality because the comparison group risk is based on state numbers of students, not on the often very small district numbers of students. Furthermore the Alternate Risk Ratio ensures a common standard (i.e., the comparison group identification risk) is being applied to all districts.

Below are the WESTAT guidelines to which the State adhered in making its calculations for Indicator #9:

- An Alternate Risk Ratio was not calculated/considered if there were fewer than 10 students in the racial/ethnic group of interest enrolled in the district (when examining child count data)
- An Alternate Risk Ratio was not calculated if there were fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the state (when examining child count data) or if there were fewer than 10 students in the comparison group receiving special education and related services for the disability at the state level. (Note: the Alternate Risk Ratio uses state-level data to calculate the risk for the comparison group.)
- When calculating the Alternate Risk Ratio, the State used the district-level risk for the racial/ethnic group in the numerator and the state-level risk for the comparison group in the denominator.

| |
|---|
| <p>Alternate Risk Ratio = District-level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability <i>divided by</i> State-level risk for comparison group for disability</p> |
|---|

Although the number of students may be small in a given district, if the State determines that an unusually large proportion of them are receiving special education and related services either for the, the State will examine existing policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that they comply with the requirements stated in Part B of the IDEA.

The WDE evaluates whether disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification by using the above mentioned Alternate Risk Ratio. An Alternate Risk Ratio that is above the established cut score of 3.0 with a minimum “n” size of 10 for a racial or ethnic group is flagged for potential disproportionality. The table below outlines the State’s methods of addressing districts whose data are above the 3.0 threshold:

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Disproportionate Representation | 3.0 and above | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year One: District is required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities via risk-based self-assessment component of monitoring system • Year One: District receives automatic file review with WDE Special Programs Division staff |
|--|---------------|--|

Additionally the WDE will also use the Alternate Risk Ratio to determine potential under representation disproportionality. The same process used for over representation will be implemented, however the threshold used for flagging districts will vary slightly. The table below defines how districts will be flagged for under representation.

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Disproportionate Under Representation | .25 and below | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year One: District is required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities via risk-based self-assessment component of monitoring system • Year One: District receives automatic file review with WDE Special Programs Division staff |
|--|---------------|--|

At any level or year of the continuum, if the disproportionality is determined to be the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices, and procedures, the district will be required to submit a Corrective Action Plan outlining steps and a timeline for correcting the non-compliance within one year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

| District | Racial / Ethnic Group | District Enrollment of SWD in Ethnic Group | District Enrollment of SWD not in Ethnic Group | Alternate Risk Ratio | Disproportionate Level |
|----------|-----------------------|--|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Hispanic | 66 | 180 | 1.86 | Caution |
| 2 | Native American | 12 | 92 | 1.81 | Caution |
| 3 | Native American | 12 | 524 | 1.78 | Caution |
| 4 | Hispanic | 10 | 83 | 1.71 | Caution |
| 5 | Hispanic | 19 | 66 | 1.69 | Caution |
| 6 | Native American | 80 | 2 | 1.65 | Caution |
| 7 | Native American | 77 | 363 | 1.59 | Caution |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Seven of 48 districts (14.6%) were flagged at the cautionary level of disproportionality. None were flagged at the “Disproportionate” or “Disproportionate Representation” levels.

In accordance with the WDE’s plan for addressing disproportionality, the seven districts that fell into the “Caution” level based on their FFY 2005 data have been “flagged” in the State’s system. The WDE is performing internal analyses and further drill down of these district data, including analyses of trend data.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2010 | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| (2010-2011) | identification. |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Analyze 618 data to determine baseline data | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division |
| 2. Define disproportionate representation | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Education and Data Divisions Stakeholder group |
| 3. Establish rubric to evaluate whether or not disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division Stakeholder group |
| 4. Determine appropriate improvement activities | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Stakeholder group |
| 5. Develop better self assessment tool for districts to use when examining policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of children with disabilities | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division TAESE/MPPRC Data Driven Enterprises NCCREST MPPRC/TAESE |

SPP – Part B (3)

Wyoming

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6. Provide technical assistance to districts on developing appropriate district policies, procedures and practices | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division TAESE/MPRRC |
| 7. Participate on the WDE Cross Collaborative Team for At Risk Students | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE staff members NWREL |

| |
|--|
| 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.

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

| |
|---|
| <p>Measurement: Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.</p> |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Currently the Wyoming Department of Education collects this data through the state November 1 data collection report. The WDE reports child count and FAPE 618 data to OSEP. The WDE submits the data to the USOE clearinghouse each February and verifies the data for accuracy through LEA assurances and signatures. The WDE will use the 618 data to determine disproportionality.

During 2005-2006, WDE analyzed 618 data at the local and state levels. The state then determined a standard for significant disproportionality and applied it to the disaggregated 618 data. The WDE used the Alternate Risk Ratio as defined by OSEP/WESTAT for determining disproportionality because it is most relevant and meaningful for Wyoming’s rural population.

Wyoming’s small homogeneous population makes determining disproportionate representation a challenge. The WDE reviews potential disproportionality as part of the special education monitoring process. In many Wyoming districts, even one student in a specific disability category will cause the data to appear disproportionate.

WDE Alternate Risk Ratio

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. Furthermore, it is impossible to calculate risk ratios if there are no students in the comparison group (i.e., the risk for the comparison group cannot be calculated) or if none of the students in the comparison group receives special education and related services either for the disability or in the educational environment (i.e., the risk for the comparison group is zero). For these reasons, the State opted to use the Alternate Risk Ratio when calculating disproportionality for this indicator.

The Alternate Risk Ratio provides for a more reliable indicator of disproportionality because the comparison group risk is based on state numbers of students, not on the often very small district numbers of students. Furthermore the Alternate Risk Ratio ensures a common standard (i.e., the comparison group identification risk) is being applied to all districts.

Below are the WESTAT guidelines to which the State adhered in making its calculations for Indicator #10:

- An Alternate Risk Ratio was not calculated/considered if there were fewer than 10 students in the racial/ethnic group of interest enrolled in the district (when examining child count data).
- An Alternate Risk Ratio was not calculated if there were fewer than 10 students in the comparison group enrolled in the state (when examining child count data) or if there were fewer than 10 students in the comparison group receiving special education and related services for the disability at the state level. (Note: the Alternate Risk Ratio uses state-level data to calculate the risk for the comparison group.)
- When calculating the Alternate Risk Ratio, the State used the district-level risk for the racial/ethnic group in the numerator and the state-level risk for the comparison group in the denominator.

| |
|---|
| <p>Alternate Risk Ratio = District-level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability <i>divided by</i> State-level risk for comparison group for disability</p> |
|---|

Although the number of students may be small in a given district, if the State determines that an unusually large proportion of them are receiving special education and related services either for the disability, the State will examine existing policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that they comply with the requirements stated in Part B of the IDEA.

The WDE evaluates whether disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification by using the above mentioned Alternate Risk Ratio. An Alternate Risk Ratio that is above the established cut score of 3.0 with a minimum “n” size of 10 for a racial or ethnic group is flagged for potential disproportionality. The table below outlines the State’s methods of addressing districts whose data are above the 3.0 threshold:

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Disproportionate Representation | 3.0 and above | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year One: District is required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities via risk-based self-assessment component of monitoring system • Year One: District receives automatic file review with WDE Special Programs Division staff |
|--|---------------|--|

Additionally the WDE will also use the Alternate Risk Ratio to determine potential under representation disproportionality. The WDE uses the same process as over representation and the threshold is defined below.

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Disproportionate Under Representation | .25 and below | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year One: District is required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities via risk-based self-assessment component of monitoring system • Year One: District receives automatic file review with WDE Special Programs Division staff |
|--|---------------|--|

At any level or year of the continuum, if the disproportionality is determined to be the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices, and procedures, the district is required to submit a Corrective Action Plan outlining steps and a timeline for correcting the non-compliance within one year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

| District | Racial / Ethnic Group | Primary Disability | District Enrollment of SWD in Ethnic Group with Same PD | District Enrollment of SWD not in Ethnic Group with Same PD | Alternate Risk Ratio | Level |
|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|---|---|----------------------|------------------|
| 1 | White | AT | 15 | 0 | 3.14 | Disproportionate |
| 1 | Hispanic | ED | 14 | 70 | 2.69 | Warning |
| 2 | Native American | LD | 16 | 21 | 2.76 | Warning |
| 3 | Native American | LD | 77 | 0 | 2.47 | Caution |
| 4 | Native American | ED | 16 | 54 | 4.18 | Disproportionate |
| 4 | White | ED | 50 | 20 | 2.01 | Caution |
| 5 | Hispanic | HL | 10 | 24 | 2.14 | Caution |
| 6 | White | HL | 28 | 5 | 2.11 | Caution |
| 7 | Asian | SL | 11 | 364 | 2.76 | Warning |
| 7 | White | AT | 36 | 3 | 2.08 | Caution |
| 8 | Native American | LD | 11 | 38 | 3.95 | Disproportionate |
| 9 | White | AT | 10 | 2 | 2.64 | Warning |
| 9 | Hispanic | SL | 22 | 88 | 2.03 | Caution |
| 10 | Hispanic | LD | 47 | 107 | 3.63 | Disproportionate |
| 11 | White | LD | 14 | 0 | 2.02 | Caution |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In accordance with the WDE's plan for addressing disproportionality, eleven unique districts (22.9% of the 48 districts) were identified as having alternate risk ratios above the 2.0 threshold. Three of these districts were "flagged" for having alternate risk ratios above 2.0 in two different racial/ethnic groups and/or primary disability categories.

- Seven of 48 districts (14.6%) fell into the "Caution" level based on their FFY 2005 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.
- Four of 48 districts (8.3%) 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.
- Four of 48 districts (8.3%) 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 Division staff.
- 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.

Wyoming's small homogeneous population makes determining disproportionate representation a challenge. In many Wyoming districts, even one student in a specific disability category will cause the data to appear disproportionate. In drilling down the data from these eleven districts, trend data were

hard to identify due to the small numbers of students with disabilities in any given racial/ethnic category.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories are the result of inappropriate identification. |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Analyze 618 data to determine baseline data | X | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division Data Driven Enterprises |
| 2. Define disproportionate representation | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Education and Data Divisions Stakeholder group Data Driven Enterprises MPRRC/TAESE |
| 3. Establish rubric to evaluate whether or not disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification | | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division Stakeholder group WASEA NCCRESt MPRRC/TAESE |
| 4. Determine appropriate improvement activities | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP Stakeholder group WASEA |
| 5. Develop better self assessment tool for districts to use when examining policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of children with disabilities | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP TAESE/MPRRC |
| 6. Provide technical assistance to districts on developing appropriate district policies, procedures and practices | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division TAESE/MPRRC |
| 7. Participate on the WDE Cross Collaborative Team regarding At Risk Students | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE staff members NWREL TAESE/MPRRC |

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))

New indicator on initial eligibility – if from monitoring sample selection explained

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The WDE will ensure that children referred for special education and related services are evaluated and, as appropriate, offered services within the timelines set in IDEA 2004 and reinforce through proposed State rules and regulations. Wyoming's Chapter 7 Rules require districts and public agencies to determine if the child is a child with a disability and determine the educational needs of the child within 60 days of receiving parental consent to evaluate.

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, the WDE required 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 the reason evaluation/eligibility was not determined within the timeline.

The WDE incorporated 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 will be required to provide, as part of the WDE risk-based self assessment focused monitoring, an explanation of any evaluation not completed in the 60 day timeline. If a district has 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 will be required to provide the WDE with a plan to correct the non-compliance within one year.

Monitoring of Regional Preschool Development Centers

Wyoming's preschool monitoring process is founded upon federal and state rules and regulations governing the Part C and 619 Part B programs. These regulations include IDEA, OSEP guidance, and the Wyoming Department of Education Rules and Regulations. These governing entities require that the programs provide comprehensive services to the children and the families that they serve as well as monitoring of these services.

The monitoring process is based upon the integration of information at several different levels. The process includes electronic file reviews of 100% of the child files and the most recent parent survey prior to an on-site visit. The on-site monitoring visit includes focused group sessions that include staff, parents, and community members and also includes a review of program data and 15% of the child files. This monitoring process is also comprised of an annual program self-assessment which includes a review of 5% of the child files and a focus group session for the administrative-level program staff during the on-site visit. The process employs a team approach to gathering the information via teams of Program Improvement Facilitators hosting the focus group session to the desk audits and file reviews completed on site by EIEP/WDE staff and peer reviewers from a visiting CDC. The process highlights the focus on children and families by allowing opportunities for feedback through parent surveys and focus groups.

The monitoring process focuses on the strengths of the CDCs and provides technical assistance or support necessary to improve services to children and families. The monitoring process results in a Corrective Action Plan if the state identifies any areas of noncompliance in its report to the region. This plan outlines improvement activities to correct noncompliance identified in the CDCs (see Attachment 5: *Preschool Monitoring Protocol*).

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Since Indicator 11 was a new indicator on the FFY 2004 SPP, the data reported below serves as the State's baseline data for its elementary and secondary school population served under Part B:

| DISTRICT | # Children for Whom Parental Consent to Evaluate was Received (a) | # Determined not Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (b) | # Determined Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (c) | # Children whose Evaluations not Completed w/in 60 Days | Percent = $[(B+C)/(A)]*100$ |
|-------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| STATE TOTAL | 1549 | 26 | 1128 | 395 | 74% |
| 1 | 56 | | 48 | 8 | 86% |
| 2 | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 25% |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | 7 | | 5 | 2 | 71% |
| 5 | 22 | | 13 | 9 | 59% |
| 6 | 202 | | 149 | 53 | 74% |
| 7 | 24 | | 18 | 6 | 75% |
| 8 | 7 | | 5 | 2 | 71% |
| 9 | 45 | | 36 | 9 | 80% |
| 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 100% |
| 11 | 9 | | 7 | 2 | 78% |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | | | 100% |
| 13 | 4 | | 4 | | 100% |
| 14 | 11 | | 7 | 4 | 64% |
| 15 | 2 | | | 2 | 0% |

| 16 | 5 | | 5 | | 100% |
|----------|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 17 | 5 | | 3 | 2 | 60% |
| 18 | 37 | | 29 | 8 | 78% |
| 19 | 20 | | 20 | | 100% |
| 20 | 23 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 22% |
| 21 | 10 | | 8 | 2 | 80% |
| 22 | 25 | | 12 | 13 | 48% |
| 23 | 187 | | 164 | 23 | 88% |
| 24 | 19 | | 17 | 2 | 89% |
| 25 | 13 | | 12 | 1 | 92% |
| 26 | 46 | 8 | 26 | 12 | 74% |
| DISTRICT | # Children for Whom Parental Consent to Evaluate was Received (a) | # Determined not Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (b) | # Determined Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (c) | # Children whose Evaluations not Completed w/in 60 Days | Percent = $[(B+C)/(A)]*100$ |
| 27 | 170 | | 124 | 46 | 73% |
| 28 | 8 | | 6 | 2 | 75% |
| 29 | 8 | | 3 | 5 | 38% |
| 30 | 88 | | 49 | 39 | 56% |
| 31 | 10 | | 10 | | 100% |
| 32 | 20 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 55% |
| 33 | 1 | | 1 | | 100% |
| 34 | 11 | | 9 | 2 | 82% |
| 35 | 38 | 11 | 21 | 6 | 84% |
| 36 | 3 | | 3 | | 100% |
| 37 | 20 | | 15 | 5 | 75% |
| 38 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 100% |
| 39 | 67 | | 54 | 13 | 81% |
| 40 | 104 | | 69 | 35 | 66% |
| 41 | 52 | | 39 | 13 | 75% |
| 42 | 36 | | 29 | 7 | 81% |
| 43 | 12 | | 10 | 2 | 83% |
| 44 | 6 | | 4 | 2 | 67% |
| 45 | 68 | | 43 | 25 | 63% |
| 46 | 1 | | | 1 | 0% |
| 47 | 23 | | 22 | 1 | 96% |
| 48 | 6 | | 5 | 1 | 83% |

The data reported below serves as the State’s baseline data for its preschool population served under Part B:

| Region | # Children for Whom Parental Consent to Evaluate was Received (a) | # Determined not Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (b) | # Determined Eligible whose Evaluations Completed w/in 60 Days (c) | # Children whose Evaluations not Completed w/in 60 Days | Percent = $[(B+C)/(A)]*100$ |
|---------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 191 | 35 | 139 | 17 | 91.10% |
| 3 | 41 | 10 | 30 | 1 | 97.56% |
| 4 | 36 | 6 | 30 | 0 | 100.00% |
| 5 | 46 | 0 | 44 | 2 | 95.65% |
| 14 | 14 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 92.86% |
| Totals | 328 | 51 | 256 | 21 | 95.43 |

See Attachment 6: *Account for Children for Whom Eligibility not Determined within 60 Days*

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The WDE collected the baseline data for July 01, 2005 through June 30, 2006 and required districts to provide explanations for each instance in which the 60 day timeline was not met. Based on the data, 25% of initial evaluations were not conducted within 60 days. In discussing this requirement with LEA special education directors, it became clear that there was significant confusion regarding this requirement. Through the improvement activities listed below, the WDE will provide clarification and technical assistance to all LEAs in order to ensure 100% compliance with this target.

Wyoming gathers preschool data for Indicator 11 through the self-assessment, electronic file review, and on-site file review components of its monitoring of the 14 regional Preschool Development Centers. Five of the regions are monitored every year, except every third year in which 4 regions are monitored. The data from regions monitored in FFY 2005 show a need for improvement in order for the state to meet its target of 100% compliance for this indicator. Of the 16 cases in which children’s parents gave consent for an evaluation, yet did not have an evaluation completed and eligibility determined within 60 days, the following explanations were found in the children’s files or provided by Center staff:

The WDE and EIEP are concerned about the wide range of days shown in the table above and are troubled by many of the explanations offered for such delays. Regions not meeting this requirement must address the issue in their respective Corrective Action Plans, and significant technical assistance will be provided to each of regions in order to move them toward the 100% target. The state will also aggressively pursue its improvement activities as described in the SPP (particularly #9) in order to achieve its 100% target for this indicator.

In addition, the EIEP is revising its method of collecting this data from the Preschool Development Centers. The agency is in the process of developing a method of collecting this data through self-assessment from all regions 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) as reflected in Indicator 11. On-site monitoring visits will include verification of the data submitted by each region for the previous year.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% met 60-day timeline for initial evaluations |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Notify all districts of new data collection requirement for this indicator beginning 07/01/05 | X | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division |
| 2. Amend monitoring procedures to consider 60-day timelines for initial evaluations | X | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division |
| 3. Amend monitoring system to include the review of files for students found not eligible | X | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division |
| 4. Modify data collection requirements to include information for this indicator | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions Data Driven Enterprises |
| 5. Improve the self-assessment process annually; address reasons the timeline was not met | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP |
| 6. Provide technical assistance to districts to collect baseline, annual evaluation and outcomes data as requested | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions Data Driven Enterprises LEAs |
| 7. Implement focused monitoring process to review districts with areas of concern based upon review of data for monitoring priorities | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division LEAs Data Driven Enterprises |
| 8. Add this indicator to EIEP monitoring file review | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP MPRRC/TAESE WDE Special Programs Division |
| 9. Provide TA to CDCs to ensure knowledge of and compliance with IDEA | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP NECTAC MPRRC |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 10. Modify WDE reporting tool to include this indicator | | | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP MPRRC NECTAC |
| 11. Develop needed data collection mechanisms for online database to facilitate annual statewide data collection | | | X | | | | | | EIEP WDE |
| 12. Analyze data to determine if individual training, corrective action plans, or statewide TA is needed to meet target for this indicator | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division Data Driven Enterprises |
| 13. Report data back to each individual CDC to provide information for continuous program improvement | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP Data Driven Enterprises |
| 14. Assist districts and CDCs with the review and development of appropriate policies, procedures, and practices | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP MPRRC/TAESE |

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.

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

Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The WDE and the EIEP will monitor the CDCs to ensure that children referred by Part C have an IEP developed prior to the third birthday. The information is obtained through the file review conducted during on-site monitoring of CDCs. Progress toward implementing Corrective Action Plans will be submitted to the WDE. See monitoring protocol attached.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

| 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 | # files reviewed | Yes | No | Not eligible for Part B |
| 2 | 13 | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 38 | 34 | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 1 |
| 10 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Total: | | 127 | 3 | 3 |
| $127 / (133 - 3) \times 100 = 97.69\%$ | | | | |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The statewide percentage of children eligible for Part B services with an IEP in place by their third birthday is 97.69%.

Files of the three children that did not have IEPs in place by age three were reviewed. One preschooler moved from program to program then left the CDC prior to the development of the IEP.

The IEPs for two preschoolers were not completed by age three because IEP meetings were held from 4-11 weeks late on the IEP effective date. Region 7 has developed a corrective action plan to ensure IEPs are developed prior to the third birthday.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of children eligible transition from Part C to Part B by 3 rd birthday |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Identify and review regions with late IEPs to do determine trends and to identify necessary TA | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP NECTAC MPRRC/TAESE |
| 2. Develop training for regions to ensure adequate parental participation | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP NECTAC MPRRC/TAESE |
| 3. Provide guidance document for the CDCs regarding transition from Part C to Part B | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE |
| 4. Provide training to CDC staff regarding transition from Part C to Part B | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP MPRRC/TAESE |

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition |
|---|

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| Data Source: Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system. |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Wyoming Department of Education continuously works to ensure that all districts are in compliance regarding the completion of secondary transition plans for all students with disabilities ages 16 and older to facilitate successful post school transitions.

From 1999-2000, the Wyoming Transition Council conducted an initiative to determine the status of secondary transition activities in Wyoming through surveys, file reviews and interviews. The results indicated that all LEAs had plans in place to implement secondary transition activities. However, the lack of a statewide program led to differences in the delivery of transition activities across the state.

In June 2004, the WDE appointed a secondary transition consultant to facilitate the Wyoming Transition Council, continue to develop a statewide plan for secondary transition and provide technical assistance to LEAs. The WDE also conducted follow-up interviews of the 2000 transition initiative and updated data from all 48 districts.

The Secondary Transition Council was activated again in 2005 and has been active in developing transition documents and providing technical assistance to districts on appropriate use and goal setting. The Council has provided transition training at the School Improvement Conference, spring and fall 2006. Training has been provided on transition services, transition assessment, IEP development, measurable post secondary goals, and understanding the summary of performance document, exit survey and the post secondary data collection process. Materials from trainings are available on our website.

Vocational education experiences are a proven predictor of post school success, especially for students with disabilities. The remoteness and small population of many Wyoming school districts limit the opportunities for students leaving secondary schools. The WDE will work with the Wyoming Transition Council to identify creative and flexible strategies to allow students to participate in vocational opportunities available in individual communities. The Wyoming Transition Council includes representation from the community colleges and the University of Wyoming as well as Workforce Services Centers to increase awareness of the need for more vocational education programs, especially programs that would serve students with disabilities. The WDE will work with LEAs and service providers to implement strategies to best meet the needs of individual students with disabilities.


To collect data for this indicator, the WDE selects a stratified, representative sample of 12 student files from each district in the state. Trained WDE staff members then review each of the files using the NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist Form A. Any file that meets all 8 of the checklist criteria or 7 of 8, if the criterion regarding participating agency is non-applicable, is judged to meet the indicator.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009:

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

| | FFY 2009 |
|---|---------------|
| # of youth whose IEPs were reviewed | 469 |
| # of youth whose IEPs were compliant upon initial review | 256 |
| Percent of youth whose IEPs met the indicator after initial review | 54.6% |
| # of youth whose IEPs were compliant after district corrective action (within FFY 2009) | 213 |
| # of youth whose IEPs met the indicator for FFY 2009 | 469 |
| Percent of youth whose IEPs met the indicator for FFY 2009 | 100.0% |

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



Note: FFY 2009 data shown on Display 13-2 are prior to district corrections made during the same school year; all districts achieved 100% compliance during FFY 2009.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data on this indicator were collected from each LEA using the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center's (NSTTAC) I-13 Checklist. The NSTTAC Checklist was completed on a representative sample of 469 IEPs from all forty-eight districts in the state. By collecting data from each of the districts in the state, the Special Programs Division is assured that data aggregated across the districts is representative of the state.

In the winter of 2010, WDE requested a stratified, random sample totaling 469 students with disabilities age 16 and above from all forty-eight Wyoming school districts for an internal transition file review. The files were then reviewed by the Special Programs Division staff using the NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist. At the conclusion of the initial review, WDE identified forty-three LEAs that had at least one transition IEP that demonstrated evidence of noncompliance with one or more of the IDEA postsecondary transition requirements. WDE elected to make a single finding in each LEA's case rather than making multiple findings for similar infractions in a single LEA. The breakdown of transition issues was as follows:

- 70 IEPs lacked one or more measurable postsecondary goals
- 17 IEPs did not appear to contain postsecondary goal(s) that were updated annually
- 41 IEPs did not contain evidence that the students' postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessments
- 26 IEPs lacked evidence of appropriate transition services
- 36 IEPs did not include courses of study, designed to improve the students' academic and functional achievement and facilitate their movement to post-school opportunities
- 23 IEPs lacked annual goals reasonably designed to enable the student to meet the postsecondary goal(s)
- 82 IEPs did not contain evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting where transition services were discussed
- 179 IEPs lacked evidence that representatives from outside agencies were invited to the meeting (when the file documented that their participation would be desirable)

Each LEA demonstrating one or more instance of noncompliance was contacted by the WDE Special Programs Division via certified mail. The WDE's correspondence identified each student (by WISER ID number) found to have transition deficiency in their current IEP and informed the LEA as to which specific areas were out of compliance. LEAs were required to take the necessary steps to correct the IEPs out of compliance within forty-five days. After correcting the identified issue(s), the LEAs were required to provide timely, written assurance to the WDE Special Programs Division that each instance of noncompliance was corrected.

Through receipt of timely assurance letters and documentation submitted by districts showing corrections made to individual students' programs, the WDE verified that all 43 LEAs had corrected each individual instance of noncompliance within the 45-day timeframe. The WDE is confident that each LEA is now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and has developed and implemented an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA (consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02).

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>2009 (2009-2010)</p> | <p>100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> |
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | <p>100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> |
| <p>2011 (2011-2012)</p> | <p>100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> |
| <p>2012 (2012-2013)</p> | <p>100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | Resources |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | |
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| <p><i>Design an integrated professional development and technical assistance system which supports school improvement efforts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives from the Special Programs Division are part of the team that oversees the Statewide System of Support providing | X | X | X | X | <p>WDE Special Programs Division NWRCC NPDCI University of Oregon PBIS RTI/IRIS Center</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| <p>targeted technical assistance to school districts across Wyoming in accordance with 20 U.S.C.A. §6301-6578 of the ESEA.</p> <p>The WDE provides direct support and technical assistance to districts and individual schools to help them build capacity for meaningful change that will improve academic outcomes.</p> | | | | | <p>Center on Instruction</p> |
| <p><i>Develop a recruitment/retention system to assist LEAs in the recruiting and retaining of special education administrators, teachers, and related service providers.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDE, in collaboration with Texas Tech University, provided a distance learning opportunity for local educators to build state capacity of highly qualified instructors: Teachers for the Visually Impaired, Teachers of the Deaf / Hard of Hearing, Certified Orientation and Mobility Instructors and Teachers of the Deaf-Blind. One purpose of the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is to assist schools in the implementation of a three-tiered model of support (academic and behavior) for all struggling learners. A primary focus of the SPDG is to ensure implementation with fidelity through the provision of coaching and mentoring to LEAs involved in the RtI and PBIS projects. | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>WDE Special Programs Division</p> <p>National Personnel Center Projects</p> <p>Wyoming Diversity Task Force</p> <p>NASDSE</p> <p>NCCREST</p> <p>University of Wyoming</p> <p>Texas Tech University</p> <p>Wyoming Deaf-Blind Project</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p><i>Conduct annual data share out with Special Education staff in order to clarify data collection sources. Monitor data submissions and provide ongoing technical assistance in the provision of valid and reliable data through annual data share out, state and regular conferences, and one-on-one discussions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WDE Special Programs Division and Data Driven Enterprises provide districts with data notebooks for review prior to the annual data share out. | X | X | X | X | <p>WDE Special Programs Division</p> <p>Data Driven Enterprises (DDE)</p> |
| <p><i>Improve communication and transition support efforts between Service agencies and districts for students as they exit public education.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDE provides communication and representation through continued membership on the State of Wyoming Governor’s State Rehabilitation Council (SRC). | X | X | X | X | <p>WDE Special Programs Division</p> <p>Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and Workforce Services</p> <p>LEAs Middle and High Schools</p> |

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In the spring of each year, districts are required to provide current contact information on students with disabilities who exited high school during the prior school year. Exiters are students with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma, completed high school with a certificate or modified diploma, who dropped-out, who reached maximum age (21) for receipt of special education services, or who moved out of district and weren't known to be continuing. Given the small number of exiters statewide, WDE will not be implementing sampling. Each year there will be an attempt to contact all exiters.

Districts are given the WISER ID number (the state-assigned student ID number) of all their high-school exiters and asked to provide the student name, phone number, address and measurable post school goal(s). Professional phone interviews are then conducted and attempts to call each of the exiters are provided through a contract with a third party vendor.

As per the Part B Measurement Table, definitions are as follows:

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

Baseline Data for FFY2009 (2009-2010):

Display 14-1: Number and Percent of Exiters Engaged in Employment and/or Education

| Category | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| Interviewed Exiters | 260 | 100.0% |
| Measurement A: Percent of youth enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; | 104 | 40.0% |
| Measurement B: Measurement A plus percent of youth competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 160 | 61.5% |
| Measurement C: Measurement B plus percent of youth enrolled in any other type of post-secondary education/training or employed in any other type of employment | 188 | 72.3% |

Display 14-2: Number and Percent of Exiters in each of Four Categories

| Category | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| 1. Enrolled in higher education as defined in measure A | 104 | 40.0% |
| 2. Engaged in Competitive employment as defined in measure B (but not in 1.) | 56 | 21.5% |
| 3. Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as defined in measure C (but not in 1. or 2.) | 12 | 4.6% |
| 4. Engaged in some other employment as defined in measure C (but not in 1. or 2. or 3.) | 16 | 6.2% |
| Not in any of the above four categories | 72 | 27.7% |
| Total | 260 | 100.0% |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In April 2010, contact information was obtained on the 697 students with disabilities who exited Wyoming schools in 2008-09. These exiters were attempted to be reached on the phone in June 2010.

260 exiters were successfully interviewed on the phone for a response rate of 37.3%. 264 exiters had incorrect phone numbers. If these “non-reachable” exiters are excluded from the denominator, the adjusted response rate is 60.0% (260/433).

The response rates were analyzed by demographic characteristics: gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of exiter. No significant differences existed in response rates by gender or primary disability. Students who graduated with a regular diploma were more likely to respond (40%) than students who dropped out (30%). Furthermore, Native American students were less likely to respond (15%) than other students (39%).

Of those LEAs that had at least 11 exiters, the response rate by LEA varied from 9% to 55%. The differences in response rates by districts and by demographic category were minor enough that the WDE is confident that these results are representative of the state.

The responses were also analyzed by these same demographic characteristics. Results of those who were contacted show that students who graduated with a regular diploma were more likely to be engaged in employment or education (Measure C) (78%) than students who dropped out (65%) or than students who received a certificate or aged out (57%).

Discussion has already taken place regarding how to improve the overall response rate and the response rate by districts. The WDE will provide districts with an end of school year reminder about the importance of maintaining accurate contact information with exiting students and in the future WDE plans to develop incentives for districts with the highest response rates.

| | Measurable and Rigorous Target | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| FFY | Measure A | Measure B | Measure C |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 40.0% | 61.5% | 72.3% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 40.3% | 61.8% | 72.6% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 41.0% | 62.5% | 73.3% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | |
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| <p><i>Design an integrated professional development and technical assistance system which supports school improvement efforts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives from the Special Programs Division are part of the team that oversees the Statewide System of Support providing targeted technical assistance to school districts across Wyoming in accordance with 20 U.S.C.A. §6301-6578 of the ESEA. The WDE provides direct support and technical assistance to districts and individual schools to help them build capacity for meaningful change that will improve academic | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division NWRCC NPDCI University of Oregon PBIS RTI/IRIS Center Center on Instruction |

| outcomes. | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implement Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in secondary settings across the state to facilitate an increase in student engagement, the likelihood students will graduate, and successful post-school outcomes; as well as a decrease in students dropping out. | X | X | X | X | WDE PBIS Coordinator WDE Special Programs Division and contract consultants University of Oregon (PBIS.org) Data Driven Enterprises School-Wide Information Systems (SWIS) Partners for Learning |
| <p><i>Increasing the number of districts and higher education facilities implementing Project Eye to Eye by one college and one district per year.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDE continued to provide collaboration of Casper College and Natrona County School District #1 in implementing Project Eye to Eye during the 2009-2010 school year. | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division National Eye to Eye Coordinator Community Colleges University of Wyoming LEAs Middle and High Schools |

| |
|--|
| 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))

Monitoring sampling description

| |
|---|
| <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p> |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The SPP has increased data accountability, and in response, Wyoming designed a comprehensive data-based monitoring system to meet the numerous challenges of a rural state with limited resources.

The monitoring system framework includes the following components: stable and risk-based self-assessment, on-site targeted and on-site random focused monitoring and IDEA compliance monitoring. The SPP indicators are used as a guide: each indicator is assigned to at least one of the system components. Data disaggregation is used as a key problem-identifying tool and as a monitoring and self-monitoring tool to aid in the creation of compliance hypotheses by the WDE. The system is designed to balance all SPP indicators with measurable student outcomes and allows for opportunities to examine all the other IDEA regulations simultaneously.

The self-assessment component is comprised of two subsets: stable and risk-based. The stable self-assessment is completed annually by all LEAs and IEUs and includes a student file review, transition checklist, data accuracy verification, suspension/expulsion data, and out-of-district placement data. The risk-based self assessment is completed by any LEA or IEU whose data fall outside a defined range. This data set includes district AYP status, statewide assessment participation rates, disproportionality and evaluation timelines. Finally, the on-site component is determined with a weighted system using a combination of these indicators: graduation rate, dropout rate, statewide assessment proficiency rate, and least restrictive environment data. Parent survey data and due process complaints also influence the on-site decision.

Using the weighted formula, districts are selected for on-site monitoring from three population categories: small, medium, and large. Districts are ranked annually based on percentages taken from the weighted system. WDE then selects the three lowest performers from each population category for on-site monitoring. In addition to the nine LEAs selected through this process, four additional LEAs, institutions and IEUs are randomly selected for on-site monitoring.

Similar to the stakeholder group assembled to develop the SPP, WDE formed a stakeholder group to assist the department in developing its new monitoring system. The stakeholder group includes district staff, parents, advocates, representatives from other state agencies and policy makers. Because this group represents various organizations and views, members provide valuable perspectives to this

process. The stakeholder group assists the State in identifying priority indicators used in selecting districts for on-site monitoring, selecting targets and triggers, and reviewing the indicators and the results of the monitoring system annually. The priority indicators may change annually as a result of this review.

The comprehensive nature and flexibility of Wyoming's new procedure allows WDE to monitor school districts, developmental preschools and institution facilities, and incorporates components of compliance, continuous improvement and focused monitoring systems. Wyoming's monitoring design is multi-dimensional because no single system allows a state to satisfy its general supervision requirements. As a small state with limited resources and capacities, the new system will allow the WDE to carry out all general supervision requirements more effectively and efficiently.

Each year the WDE will conduct an on-site monitoring of thirteen districts/institutions: nine districts selected based on the priority indicators, two districts randomly selected and two state institutions. In addition the WDE will assist with the monitoring of regional preschool development centers. At the completion of each monitoring visit the district/institution will receive a comprehensive report explaining the how the monitoring process resulted in any findings of non-compliance. For each area of noncompliance a district is required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP will include the following components: a statement/finding of non-compliance, baseline data, required outcome (in compliance language), steps, activities, timeline, person responsible for completion activities and evidence activities occurred, follow up tracking, and assurances from district administration indicating knowledge of the noncompliance and the plan to resolve the noncompliance.

Any district exhibiting exemplarily performance may be rewarded with the following incentives: waivers for national or state conferences, a letter to the local school board and/or superintendent, removal from the random monitoring pool and/or public recognition of best practices through a special programs newsletter. Accordingly any district choosing not to cooperate or habitually having non-compliance issues which are not resolved, the WDE will employ the following sanctions: notify district superintendent, notify school board chairperson, request face to face meeting with school officials, notify State Advisory Panel, effect accreditation status, hire an outside consultant to develop CAP with district using Federal Part B funds to pay for this service, and ultimately withholding part or all of federal Part B funds.

Annually, as part of WDE's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System, each district and public agency will be evaluated using the criteria set forth in Wyoming Chapter 7 Rules Governing Services for Children with Disabilities, Part 8, Section 7, WDE Determinations. Based on the results of this review each district and public agency will be put into the following four categories: meets the requirements; needs assistance, needs intervention, and needs substantial intervention. Depending on the district and public agency determination the WDE will require a corrective action plan or improvement plan to correct the problems. The WDE will also work cooperatively with any and all districts or public agencies to provide technical assistance when necessary.

Monitoring of Regional Preschool Development Centers

Wyoming's preschool monitoring process is founded upon federal and state rules and regulations governing the Part C and 619 Part B programs. These regulations include IDEA, OSEP guidance, and the Wyoming Department of Education Rules and Regulations. These governing entities require that the programs provide comprehensive services to the children and the families that they serve as well as monitoring of these services.

The monitoring process is based upon the integration of information at several different levels. The process includes electronic file reviews of 100% of the child files and the most recent parent survey prior to an on-site visit. The on-site monitoring visit includes focused group sessions that include staff, parents, and community members and also includes a review of program data and 15% of the child files. This monitoring process is also comprised of an annual program self–assessment which includes a review of 5% of the child files and a focus group session for the administrative-level program staff during the on-site visit. The process employs a team approach to gathering the information via teams of Program Improvement Facilitators hosting the focus group session to the desk audits and file reviews completed on site by EIEP/WDE staff and peer reviewers from a visiting CDC. The process highlights the focus on children and families by allowing opportunities for feedback through parent surveys and focus groups.

The monitoring process focuses on the strengths of the CDCs and provides technical assistance or support necessary to improve services to children and families. The monitoring process results in a Corrective Action Plan if the state identifies any areas of noncompliance in its report to the region. This plan outlines improvement activities to correct noncompliance identified in the CDCs (see Attachment 5: *Preschool Monitoring Protocol*).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

| Sub Indicator A | 2004-2005 |
|---|-------------|
| A. Monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year | 100% (n=11) |

A. Monitoring of Priority Areas

2004-2005 K-12 Monitoring Results - Percent of Districts with Non-Compliance & Corrections made within One Year

| Number of Findings of Non-Compliance | General Supervision | FAPE | Parent Involvement | Secondary Transition | Percent of Non-Compliance corrected within one year |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|
| 5 (11 of 48 districts monitored) | 20% (1 finding) | 40% (2 findings) | 0% | 40% (2 findings) | 100% (5 findings) |

2004-2005 3-5 year old Monitoring Results Percent of Districts with Non-Compliance & Corrections made within One Year

| Number of Findings of Non-Compliance | General Supervision | FAPE | Parent Involvement | Transition at Age 5 | Percent of Non-Compliance corrected w/in one year |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| 10 (3 of 14 regions monitored) | 70% (7 findings) | 20% (2 findings) | 0% | 10% (1 finding) | 100% (10 findings) |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A. Monitoring of priority areas

Prior to 2003-2004 monitoring classifications were *Positive Areas* and *Areas Identified for Improvement*. *Areas Identified for Improvement* was not necessarily out of compliance. Due to the confusion this caused as an unclear mechanism for reporting non-compliance, the Wyoming Department of Education has changed its classifications to *Compliant* and *Non-Compliant*. The WDE special education monitoring process changed four times in the last five years due to internal changes and external requirements and recommendations from OSEP. This may account for the difference in the number of districts found out of compliance between 2003-2004 and 2004-2005.

The WDE verified that the small number of actual complaints was not due to a lack of understanding of parental rights through a parent questionnaire, evidence from the dispute resolution process and confirmation from the Parent Information Center.

Preschool Development Center Monitoring

The EIEP’s monitoring system had formerly not denoted problems identified during monitoring visits in regions as “areas of noncompliance.” Previously, regions were found to have areas of strengths and areas that need improvement. Due to the reporting requirements in the SPP, EIEP reviewed each of the monitoring reports and collaborative action plans from the 2003-2004 year and assessed the findings that fall into an area of non-compliance. If there were findings of noncompliance EIEP requested a report from the region stating completed follow-up activities and status of those that were incomplete. These reports were then used to create the baseline data represented above.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>2005 (2005-2006)</p> | <p>100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year</p> |
| <p>2006 (2006-2007)</p> | <p>100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year</p> |
| <p>2007 (2007-2008)</p> | <p>100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year</p> |
| <p>2008 (2008-2009)</p> | <p>100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year</p> |
| <p>2009 (2009-2010)</p> | <p>100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year</p> |
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | <p>100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of monitoring findings related to priority areas closed within 1 year |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Notify districts of OSEP requirement to correct non compliance within one year | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division |
| 2. Provide technical assistance to districts regarding new resolution session requirement | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division State Advisory Panel Wyoming Parent Information Center |
| 3. Provide annual training for the WDE hearing and mediation officers | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE |
| 4. Review monitoring process and make necessary adjustments: explore current process and web-based monitoring for focused monitoring system | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Data Driven Enterprises MPRRC/TAESE NCSEAM |
| 5. Develop internal system to track and respond to informal complaints from LEAs, parents and stakeholders; analyze data by district | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Administration Division WDE Special Programs Division Wyoming Parent Information Center State Advisory Panel |
| 6. Implement focused monitoring and provide | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| technical assistance to districts regarding priority monitoring areas | | | | | | | | | MPPRC/TAESE WASEA LEAs |
| 7. Develop internal system for the EIEP in order to track, respond to and report informal complaints from regions, parents and stakeholders | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP Data Driven Enterprises MPPRC/TAESE Wyoming Parent Information Center State Advisory Panel EIC |
| 8. Update monitoring protocol to ensure tracking and correction of non-compliance identified in the CDCs within one year | X | | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP NECTAC MPPRC/TAESE EIC PIC |
| 9. Provide training on procedural safeguards to parents of children with disabilities | | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP PIC UPLIFT MPPRC/TAESE |
| 10. Review CDCs' complaint databases, update databases, incorporate into region's annual self assessment | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | CDCs NECTAC EIEP MPPRC/TAESE |

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**Indicator 16 revised narrative****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.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The baseline measurement is 100%

Formal Written Complaints Resulting in Investigation

| School Year | Warranted Complaints (number) | Complaints Withdrawn (number) | Complaints with Written Report (number) | Complaints with Written Report within Timeline (number) | Complaints with Written Report within Timeline (percent) |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2000-2001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100% |
| 2001-2002 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| 2002-2003 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| 2003-2004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100% |
| 2004-2005 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100% |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A review of the written complaints lodged in the past five years indicates that parties addressed all issues within the timelines. The WDE receives few written complaints each year. The small number of cases indicates a satisfaction with the special education services the state and local education agencies provide. However, the WDE wants to ensure that this small number is due to an actual lack of complaints, not a lack of knowledge about the process or parental rights. In 2005, the WDE modified the parent survey distributed to parents in monitored districts to include a question that asks parents if someone at the school has fully explained all of their rights to the parent. The WDE verified that the small number of actual complaints was not due to a lack of understanding of parental rights through a parent questionnaire, evidence from the dispute resolution process and confirmation from the Parent Information Center.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|---|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of complaints resolved within appropriate timeline |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|--|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Modify the WDE dispute resolution database to capture due process data as required by IDEA 2004 | | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE WDE legal counsel |
| 2. Evaluate and improve communication with Parent Advocacy Groups | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Parent Information Center Parent Education Network UPLIFT Wyoming Family Support Network CADRE Protection and Advocacy |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Review and analyze data and identify trends in complaints; address as needed | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP State Advisory Panel WASEA WDE legal counsel MPRRC/TAESE |
| 4. Develop internal system to track, respond to and report informal complaints from regions, parents and stakeholders | X | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP Wyoming Parent Information Center State Advisory Panel EIC UPLIFT Data Driven Enterprises |
| 5. Place parent handbook on DDD website | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP MPRRC Wyoming Early Intervention Council |
| 6. Develop parental rights and procedural safeguards training for parents | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP Wyoming Parent Information Center Governor’s Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities |

| |
|--|
| 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. |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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.

EIEP Due Process

Currently the mechanism that the EIEP uses for handling due process requests is addressed through the MOU between the DDD and the WDE. The MOU indicated that all due process requests are forwarded to and investigated by the WDE.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The baseline measurement is 100%.

Due Process Hearings

| School Year | Hearing Requests (number) | Hearings Held/Fully Adjudicated (number) | Decisions Issued Within Timeline (number) | Hearing Requests Fully Adjudicated within Timeline (percent) |
|-------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 2000-2001 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| 2001-2002 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| 2002-2003 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 100% |
| 2003-2004 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| 2004-2005 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100% |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In the two hearing requests held during the 2004-2005 school year, both parties waived the mediation option and requested due process hearings. In one case the parent chose to home school the child and withdrew the request. The other request was fully adjudicated and the hearing officer issued a decision within the timeline.

The WDE utilizes information from a variety of sources to identify systemic issues throughout the state. Each year the WDE examines district special education data and results from the monitoring and dispute resolution processes to identify potential problems. The state works with districts to provide technical assistance or trainings addressing identified areas.

The WDE verified that the small number of actual complaints was not due to a lack of understanding of parental rights through a parent questionnaire, evidence from the dispute resolution process and confirmation from the Parent Information Center.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of due process hearings fully adjudicated within 45-day timeline |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Provide technical assistance as needed in defined area of noncompliance. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division LEAs WDE hearing officers State Advisory Panel |
| 2. Provide hearing and mediation officer training | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRRC/TAESE Leadership Symposium |
| 3. Modify the WDE dispute resolution database to include due process resolution data as required by IDEA 2004 and Wyoming Rules | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRRC/TAESE WDE legal counsel State Advisory Panel |
| 4. Provide technical assistance to districts regarding due process | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRRC/TAESE Leadership Symposium |
| 5. Explore alternative methods for providing technical assistance to districts and regions | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division NASDSE MPRRRC/TAESE State Advisory Panel CADRE |
| 6. Review and analyze data and identify trends regarding due process; address as needed | | | | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division State Advisory Panel WASEA WDE legal counsel MPRRRC/TAESE |
| 7. Modify MOU to ensure adequate communication as we work through the process of resolving formal parental | | X | | X | | X | | X | WDE Special Programs Division DDD/EIEP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| complaints | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Develop internal system to track, respond to and report informal complaints from regions, parents and stakeholders | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division DDD/EIEP Wyoming Parent Information Center State Advisory Panel EIC |
| 9. Place parent handbook on DDD website | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division DDD MPRR/TAESE Wyoming Early Intervention Council |

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The LEA/Preschool Development Centers inform parents of children with disabilities in Wyoming of their rights to the dispute resolution process at each child's initial IEP meeting. The resolution session is the first step when a person requests a due process hearing. The WDE will begin to gather data regarding the percent of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions.

Baseline data regarding resolution session outcomes will be included in the WDE tracking system to ensure that the WDE and the LEA/Preschool Development Centers address and resolve all complaints, mediations and due process hearings consistent with IDEA 04 statute and regulations and the Wyoming Chapter 7 Rules *Governing Services for Children with Disabilities*.

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 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 (34 CFR§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.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

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) |
|-------------|--|---|---|--|
| 2005-2006 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100% |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

When the State resolution session hearing requests reach the minimum number of 10, the WDE looks forward to developing and discussing baseline data and improvement activities.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of resolution sessions conducted within timeline and resulting in agreement |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Modify the WDE dispute resolution database to capture due process data as required by IDEA 2004 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE WDE legal counsel Data Driven Enterprises |
| 2. Develop a system to track resolution sessions and outcome data | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Technology Divisions Wyoming Parent Information Center |
| 3. Provide TA to the districts regarding procedures for resolution process based on IDEA 2004 and Wyoming Rules | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division WDE Legal Counsel Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) MPRRC/TAESE |
| 4. Modify MOU to ensure adequate communication as we work through the process of resolving parental complaints | | X | | X | | X | | X | WDE Special Programs Division DDD/EIEP |
| 5. Develop internal system to track, respond to and report informal complaints from regions, parents and stakeholders | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP Wyoming Parent Information Center State Advisory Panel EIC UPLIFT MPRRC/TAESE |
| 6. Place parent handbook on DDD website | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | MPRRC Wyoming Early Intervention Council |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The WDE offers mediation procedures to parents and public education agencies to assist in dispute resolution. Issues involving the identification, evaluation or educational placement of a child or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to the child may be the basis of alleged disputes.

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.

EIEP Due Process

Currently the mechanism that the EIEP uses for handling mediations is addressed through the MOU between the DDD and the WDE. The MOU indicates that all mediation requests are forwarded to and mediators assigned by the WDE.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The measurement indicator is 100%.

Mediations

| School Year | Mediations | Mediation Requests Withdrawn | Mediation Agreements | Percent of Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements within Timelines |
|-------------|------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 2000-2001 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 100% |
| 2001-2002 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| 2002-2003 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 67% |
| 2003-2004 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% |
| 2004-2005 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 100% |

DDD Baseline Data

| Year | General Supervision Process | Issue | Result |
|------|---|--|---------------------------|
| 2004 | Complaint and request for Due Process requested from P&A for apparent | Alleged failure of the CDC to implement an IEP | Signed mediation resulted |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In 2002-2003 an original request for Due Process was withdrawn. The parties reached consensus and no longer requested the WDE assistance. In the last two years the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements within the timeline was 100%.

A review of complaints, mediations and due process hearings shows all issues were addressed within the timelines. Wyoming continues to have very few requests for the dispute resolution process each year. The small number of cases brought to the dispute resolution process indicates satisfaction with the special education services the state and LEAs provide. The WDE and DDD anticipate the number of mediation requests will remain low.

The WDE verified that the small number of actual complaints was not due to a lack of understanding of parental rights through a parent questionnaire, evidence from the dispute resolution process and confirmation from the Parent Information Center.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of mediations result in mediation agreements |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | | | | | | | | Resources |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | | | | | | | | |
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| 1. Analyze mediation results and provide technical assistance in identified areas as needed | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division Wyoming hearing officers WDE legal counsel Independent external consultant MPRRC/TAESE |
| 2. Modify and distribute dispute | X | X | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| resolution guidelines | | | | | | | | | EIEP MPRRC/TAESE |
| 3. Provide technical assistance to districts regarding mediations | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division MPRRC/TAESE |
| 4. Explore alternative methods for providing training to mediators | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division NASDSE MPRRC/TAESE State Advisory Panel |
| 5. Modify MOU to ensure adequate communication as we work through the process of resolving parental | | X | | X | | X | | X | WDE Special Programs Division DDD |
| 6. Develop internal system to track, respond to and report informal complaints from Regions, parents and stakeholders | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division WDH Division for Developmental Disabilities Wyoming Parent Information Center State Advisory Panel EIC UPLIFT Data Driven Enterprises |
| 7. Place parent handbook on DDD website | | X | | | | | | | WDE Special Programs Division DDD MPRRC/TAESE Wyoming Early Intervention Council |
| 8. Review CDC’s database of complaints, update database, incorporate into annual regions self assessment | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | CDC’s NECTAC MPRRC/TAESE |

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 accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The WDE works to ensure valid and clean data by comparing student level information on special education forms to student level information on other forms collected by the department. The WDE notifies the districts of any discrepancies and requires the district to correct and re-submit the data by a given date.

The WDE has improved the reporting time of special education data by improving the methods districts use to collect data. The WDE is in the process of implementing the Wyoming Integrated Statewide Education Data System that will connect the different district software systems and databases with the WDE software systems and databases. The data system will minimize the amount of data the districts collect and submit to the WDE. The WDE continues to work to meet the OSEP deadlines. Trend lines indicate the state is improving in meeting the OSEP data submission deadlines in a timely manner.

In 2004, the WDE established a system of incentives and sanctions to ensure the districts submit data in a timely manner. Sanctions include telephone calls, renegotiating submission deadlines and letters sent to the school board and district accreditation folder. Incentives include letters of recognition for timely and accurate submissions sent to the school district special education data staff, special education administrator and the school board.

Data Accuracy

The WDE integrated data collection system (WISE) will decrease the number of reports districts submit to the Data Division therefore decreasing the chance of collection errors such as duplicated counts or inaccurate entries. The WDE is participating in the ED*Facts* initiative with the U. S. Department of Education, the State Education Agencies and other collaborators to centralize all state reported data into one federally-coordinated, K-12 educational data repository. The purpose of ED*Facts* is to:

- Increase the focus on outcomes and accountability rather than process
- Provide robust K-12 business intelligence by integrating student achievement and Federal program performance data
- Reduce data collection burden for ED and the states
- Ensure that cost-effective, timely, and high-quality data are available to continuously assess the educational progress and performance of the Department, state and local educational agencies
- Provide data for program planning, policy development, and management.

EDFacts includes several components including the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and the EDEN Submission System (ESS).

The Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) is a centralized, coordinated repository of state reported, K-12, educational data residing at the U. S. Department of Education.

- EDEN houses data on over 100 data elements identified by the Department’s Strategic Accountability Service, the National Center for Education Statistics, the Department’s program offices, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as well as the Council of Chief State School Officers, state IT/data managers, state program directors, and a coordinating committee of representatives from the states and school districts.
- EDEN data is available at the state, local educational agency, and school levels, and provides information on school, district, and state characteristics; program participation; Federal funding; implementation of educational programs; staffing, and student demographics and outcomes, among others.
- A dictionary of terms and definitions is provided to the states for consistent reporting.
- EDEN’s primary customers are the U. S. Department of Education and State Education Agencies, however, as EDEN matures, plans include providing access to other key customer groups.

States report data to EDEN using the EDEN Submission System (ESS), an electronic system facilitating the efficient and timely transmission of data from SEAs to the Department. Data is transmitted by the states to meet the data requirements of annual and final grant reporting, specific program mandates, and data supporting the Government Performance and Results Act. Wyoming is one of only fourteen states to begin submitting portions of the 618 data through this mechanism. WDE believes this consolidated approach to data submission will improve the overall accuracy and reduce duplication.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

| OSEP Report | Data Submitted on or before due dates | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | Report Due Date | Date Report Submitted | Submitted on or before due date Yes/no |
| Child Count/Environment | 2/1/03 | 01/31/03 | Yes |
| Personnel/Exits/Discipline | 11/1/03 | 11/2/03 | No |
| Child Count/Environment | 2/1/04 | 2/15/04 | No |
| Personnel/Exits/Discipline | 11/1/04 | 10/20/04 | Yes |
| Child Count/Environment | 2/1/05 | 1/20/05 | Yes |

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In the 2003-2004 school year, the WDE hired and trained a new Part B data manager. During this transition period, the State was late on submitting the required 618 data tables—in both cases, however, the delay was two weeks or less.

The WDE has instituted a number of changes and procedures to ensure that its data collections and reports are of the highest level of accuracy. The implementation of the WISE system allows the WDE to create data business rules which validate data elements as they are submitted from districts. In addition the unique student identification number permits the WDE to internally crosscheck data elements between various statewide data collections.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% for timeliness; 100% for accuracy |

Over the course of the past year, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) advised and assisted by the broad stakeholder group evaluated each improvement activity in the SPP. Improvement activities that were found to be required SEA activities rather than improvement strategies that could influence improved outcomes were removed. Improvement activities were revised to include measurement indicators. On an annual basis, these improvement activities will be more closely tied to the positive outcomes for the indicator.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| | FFY years when activities will occur | |

| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| 1. Implement reward/sanction program to encourage the LEAs to implement data according to the WDE timeline | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions LEAs |
| 2. Provide technical assistance to LEA staff to submit data to the WDE | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions LEAs |
| 3. Develop and implement schedule for staff to complete individual portions of the APR | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs Division EIEP MPRRRC/TAESE RRFC |
| 4. Complete the implementation of the WISE System | X | X | X | X | | | | | WDE Data and Special Programs Divisions |
| 5. Update the internal data collection and submission procedural manual | | | X | | | | | | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions |
| 6. Update WDE forms to maintain and improve efficient data submission | | | | X | | | | | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions |
| 7. Participate in the EdFacts initiative to convert all 618 reporting to the EDEN system | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Data Divisions |
| 8. Update EIEP forms and database to maintain and improve efficient data submission | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division WDE Career, Data, Tech Division |
| 9. Develop and implement procedures and timelines for CDC data submission to EIEP | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | EIEP WDE Special Programs Division |
| 10. Explore changing collection window for Fall district data collection | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Career, Data Tech Divisions EIEP |
| 11. Develop a data integration pipeline specifically for electronic IEP systems | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | WDE Special Programs and Career, Data, Tech Divisions Data Driven Enterprises |

Attachments

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

| SECTION A: Signed, written complaints | |
|---|---|
| (1) Signed, written complaints total | 0 |
| (1.1) Complaints with reports issued | 0 |
| (a) Reports with findings | 0 |
| (b) Reports within timeline | 0 |
| (c) Reports within extended timelines | 0 |
| (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed | 0 |
| (1.3) Complaints pending | 0 |
| (a) Complaint pending a due process hearing | 0 |

| SECTION B: Mediation requests | |
|---|---|
| (2) Mediation requests total | 9 |
| (2.1) Mediations | |
| (a) Mediations related to due process | 9 |
| (i) Mediation agreements | 9 |
| (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 | 2 |
| (3.1) Resolution sessions | 0 |
| (a) Settlement agreements | 0 |
| (3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) | 1 |
| (a) Decisions within timeline | 0 |
| (b) Decisions within extended timeline | 1 |
| (3.3) Resolved without a hearing | 1 |

| 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 |

| Stakeholder Groups Required Membership | SPP Participa tion |
|--|--------------------------|
| <p><u>Early Intervention Council</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents • Service providers • State Legislature • Agency for early intervention services • Agency for preschool services • State Medicaid agency • Head Start Agency • Child Care Agency • Agency for health insurance • Office of the coordinator of homeless children and youth • State foster care representative3 • Mental Health Agency | <p>X</p> |
| <p><u>State Advisory Panel</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth – 26) • Individuals with disabilities • Teachers • Representatives of Institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel • State and local education officials including officials who carry out activities under sub title B of Title 7 of the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act • Administrators of programs for children with disabilities • Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities • Representatives of private schools and public charter schools • Not less than one representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities • A representative from the state child welfare agency responsibility for foster care • Representatives from the state Juvenile and Adult Correction agencies | <p>X</p> |
| <p><u>State Data Advisory Group</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through State Superintendent appointment and opened up to any district personnel | <p>X</p> |
| <p><u>State Rehabilitation Council</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals with disabilities from business, industry and labor | <p>X</p> |
| <p><u>Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Special Education Administrators | <p>X</p> |
| <p><u>Wyoming Transition Council</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universities and Community Colleges • Parents • Voc Rehab Counselors • Special Education Directors • Business Representatives • Workforce Services • Secondary Transition Specialists | |

Excerpt taken from www.nectac.org/~Calls/2005/Outcomes/Child/childoutcomes.asp

Child Outcomes Summary Form

Child Name: _____

Date: __/__/__

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|----------|---|----------|---|---------|---|
| To what extent does this child show behaviors and skills appropriate for his or her age across a variety of settings and situations? <i>(Circle one number)</i> | Completely | | Somewhat | | Emerging | | Not Yet | <i>(If this question has been answered previously):</i> Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to positive social relationships since the last outcomes summary? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Positive Social Relationships | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| To select an answer, think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relating with adults • Relating with other children • Following rules related to groups or interacting with others (if older than 18 months.) As indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child | | | | | | | | |
| To what extent does this child show behaviors and skills appropriate for his or her age across a variety of settings and situations? <i>(Circle one number)</i> | Completely | | Somewhat | | Emerging | | Not Yet | <i>(If this question has been answered previously):</i> Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to acquiring and using knowledge and skills since the last outcomes summary? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| To select an answer, think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thinking, reasoning, remembering, and problem solving • Understanding symbols • Understanding the physical and social worlds As indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child | | | | | | | | |
| To what extent does this child show behaviors and skills appropriate for his or her age across a variety of settings and situations? <i>(Circle one number)</i> | Completely | | Somewhat | | Emerging | | Not Yet | <i>(If this question has been answered previously):</i> Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to taking appropriate action to meet his/her needs since the last outcomes summary? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| To select an answer, think about the child's functioning in these and closely related areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking care of basic needs (e.g., showing hunger, dressing, feeding, toileting, etc.) • Contributing to own health and safety (e.g., follows rules, assists with hand washing, avoids inedible objects) (if older than 24 months.) • Getting from place to place (mobility) and using tools (e.g., forks, pencils, strings attached to objects) As indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child | | | | | | | | |

**Parent Survey – Special Education Services
Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents**

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.

1. I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

2. I was offered special assistance (such as child care) so that I could participate in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP).

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

3. At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

4. At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

5. All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

6. Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services in the regular classroom.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

7. I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

8. I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

9. My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

10. Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

11. Teachers are available to speak with me.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

12. Teachers treat me as a team member.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

13. Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

14. Teachers and administrators show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

15. Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

16. Teachers and administrators respect my cultural heritage.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

17. Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understand the Procedural Safeguards (the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents).

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

18. The school has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions.

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

- 19. **The school communicates regularly with me regarding my child’s progress on IEP goals.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree
- 20. **The school gives me choices with regard to services that address my child’s needs.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree
- 21. **The school offers parents training about special education issues.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree
- 22. **The school offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree
- 23. **The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child’s education.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree
- 24. **The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree
- 25. **The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.**
Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

26. My child’s age is: _____

27. My child’s grade is: _____

28. My child’s age when first referred to early intervention or special education _____

29. My child’s race/ethnicity is:

- African-American/Black American Indian/ Alaskan Native Asian/ Pacific Islander
- Hispanic or Latino Multiracial White

30. My child’s primary disability is (please mark only one answer):

- Autism Deaf-Blindness Deafness Developmental Delay Emotional Disability
- Hard of Hearing Learning Disability Mental Retardation Multiple Disabilities Orthopedic Impairment
- Other Health Impairment Traumatic Brain Injury
- Speech/Language Impairment Visual Impairment (including Blindness)

31. The school my child attends is: _____

Thank you for your time and input.

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, please 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.*

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Disagree or Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|----------------|
| A. My Level of Agreement | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Developmental preschool staff members: | | | | | |
| 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 |

| | No | Maybe/ Unsure | Yes |
|---|----|---------------|-----|
| B. Activities Surrounding Your Child's IEP | | | |
| 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 |

**Estado de Wyoming
Encuesta Familiar
Centro de Desarrollo Infantil Parte B**

Nombre y dirección del Centro de Desarrollo Infantil: _____

Región #: _____

Fecha de hoy: _____

Si su niño(a) es mayor de tres años de edad conteste las siguientes preguntas por favor.

Esta encuesta es para familias que reciben servicios de educación especial. Sus respuestas ayudarán a mejorar los servicios y resultados de los niños y sus familias. *Usted puede dejar sin contestar cualquier pregunta que sienta que no se aplica a usted o a su niño(a).*

| A. Mi Nivel de Acuerdo o Desacuerdo | Totalmente en Desacuerdo | Algo en Desacuerdo | No Estoy de Acuerdo ni en Desacuerdo | Algo de Acuerdo | Completamente de Acuerdo |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 21. Soy tomado en cuenta como parte del equipo por los miembros del centro de desarrollo cuando planeamos el IEP (Programa de Educación Individual) de mi niño(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Se me ha pedido mi opinión respecto a qué tan bien los servicios ofrecidos por la escuela de desarrollo sirven las necesidades de mi hijo(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Estoy satisfecho (a) con la frecuencia con que el personal de la centro de desarrollo se comunica conmigo con respecto al progreso de mi hijo(a) en los objetivos IEP (Programa de Educación Individual)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. Soy capaz de ayudar a mi niño(a) a aprender nuevas habilidades en casa | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. Entiendo las necesidades especiales de mi niño(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. Me doy cuenta del progreso de mi niño(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. Sé cuales son los servicios y programas en la comunidad que están disponibles para mi niño(a) y mi familia..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. Estoy satisfecho(a) con la ayuda que mi familia ha recibido a través del centro de desarrollo infantil..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. Estoy satisfecho(a) con los servicios que el centro de desarrollo infantil proporciona a mi niño(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. Puedo satisfacer mejor las necesidades de mi niño(a) como resultado de los servicios que él/ella recibe en el centro de desarrollo infantil..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. Entiendo mejor las necesidades de mi niño(a) como resultado de su participación en el centro de desarrollo infantil..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. El reporte de evaluación de mi niño(a) está escrito en términos que yo puedo entender..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. Los maestros están disponibles para hablar conmigo..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. Los servicios que el centro de desarrollo infantil provee han ayudado al progreso de mi niño(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <i>El personal del centro de desarrollo infantil:</i> | | | | | |
| 35. Escucha mis ideas con respecto a lo que mi niño(a) necesita..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. Considera mis ideas al evaluar servicios para mi niño(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. Explica las opciones que los padres tienen cuando discrepan con la decisión del centro de desarrollo infantil..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. Me deja decidir los servicios que mi niño(a) recibe..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39. Escucha mis inquietudes..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. Promueve mi participación en la educación de mi niño(a) en el centro de desarrollo infantil..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| B. Actividades Relacionadas con el IEP (Programa de Educación Individual) de su Niño(a) | No | Puede ser/ No estoy seguro(a) | Sí |
|---|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 14. Se me entregó una evaluación antes de la última reunión IEP de mi niño(a) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15. Se me informó sobre el progreso de mi hijo al menos dos veces en los últimos seis meses | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 16. Conozco los servicios que mi niño recibe en el programa preescolar..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 17. Mi niño(a) recibe todos los servicios indicados en su IEP..... | | | |
| 18. La reunión IEP de mi niño(a) fue programada en un horario y lugar convenientes para mí | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 19. Alguien en la escuela de desarrollo me proporcionó una copia de Los Procedimientos de Seguridad (Procedural Safeguards) que describe mis derechos como padre de un niño discapacitado | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| <i>En la última reunión IEP (Programa de Educación Individual), el equipo:</i> | | | |
| 20. Discutió varios tipos de opciones (tales como centros de desarrollo, cuidado en el hogar o cuidado en la guardería preescolar) para entregar los servicios a su niño(a) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 21. Discutió los servicios que su niño(a) necesita para ser exitoso(a)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 22. Discutió qué tipo de ayuda y de apoyo necesita su niño(a) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 23. Discutió qué condiciones especiales o modificaciones su niño(a) necesita | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. Le dio opciones de servicios orientados a las necesidades de su niño(a) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 25. Escuchó sus opiniones y sugerencias..... | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 26. Incorporó sus sugerencias en el IEP de su niño(a) | 1 | 2 | 3 |

C. Información de mi Niño(a)

- La edad de mi niño(a) es: ____ Años ____ Meses
- Edad de mi niño(a) cuando fue referido(a) por primera vez a un programa de intervención temprana o una escuela de educación especial:
____ Años ____ Meses
- Raza u origen étnico de mi niño(a) (elija una)

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 Blanco | 4 Afro americano |
| 2 Hispano o Latino | 5 Asiático o de las Islas del Pacífico |
| 3 Indio Norteamericano o Nativo de Alaska | 6 Múltiples razas |
- La principal discapacidad de mi hijo es (elija una)

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1 Autismo | 8 Discapacidad Ortopédica |
| 2 Sordo ceguera | 9 Otro Problema de Salud |
| 3 Sordera | 10 Alteración del Desarrollo |
| 4 Desorden Emocional | 11 Alteración del Habla y del Lenguaje |
| 5 Deficiencias Auditivas | 12 Lesión Cerebral Traumática |
| 6 Retardo Mental | 13 Deficiencias Visuales (Incluyendo Ceguera) |
| 7 Múltiples Discapacidades | 14 No estoy seguro(a)/ no sé |

State Performance Plan (SPP) February 2007
Wyoming State Report Card for 2005-06

| Indic. # | Indicator | Measurement | 2005-06 Target | 2005-06 Rate | Did State Meet the Target? |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 5 | LRE for Students 6 - 21 | <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. | 56.00% | 55.54% | N |
| 5B | Separate Classroom | Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. | 9.55% | 9.15% | Y |
| 5C | Separate Facilities | Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. | 2.46% | 2.63% | N |
| 6 | LRE for children 3 - 5 | Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers. | 69.84% | N/A | |
| 7 | Child outcomes for children 3 - 5 | <i>Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: (who were at age-level)</i> | | | |
| 7A | Social-emotional | Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). | TBD | 22.90% | |
| 7B | Knowledge and skills | Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy). | TBD | 22.90% | |
| 7C | Behaviors | Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. | TBD | 32.80% | |
| 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> | | | |
| | Part B 619 | Preschool (Age 3-5) | 70.20% | 70.20% | Y |
| | Part B | K-12 | N/A | N/A | |
| 9 | Disprop. R/E, Overall | Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in related services categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. | 0% | <i>Not reported in 05-06</i> | |
| 10 | Disprop. R/E, Disability Category | Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. | TBD | <i>Not reported in 05-06</i> | |
| 11 | Evaluation in 60 days | Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days. | 100.00% | 74.50% | N |
| 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% | N/A | |
| 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% | N |

State Performance Plan (SPP) February 2007

Wyoming State Report Card for 2005-06

| Indic. # | Indicator | Measurement | 2005-06 Target | 2005-06 Rate | Did State Meet the Target? |
|----------|---|---|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 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. | TBD | <i>Not reported in 05-06</i> | |
| 15 | General Supervision Noncompliance Correction | Percent of noncompliance [related to monitoring priority areas and indicators; related to areas not included in priority areas; identified through other mechanisms] corrected within one year of identification. | 100.00% | N/A | |
| 20 | General Supervision Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data | Percent of state-reported data that are timely and accurate. | 100.00% | N/A | |

| | Revised SPP Improvement Strategies | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | |
| Fiscal | LEAs and the BHD will use the WDE Grant Management System (GMS) to review and analyze performance on relevant SPP indicators. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | X | |
| | LEAs and the BHD will develop an annual plan, based on their analysis of local performance; these plans are reviewed and approved on an annual basis. They will implement activities tied to unmet SPP targets as a condition of Federal Part B funding. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | X |
| | WDE will monitor and approve LEA and BHD drawdown reports and requests for funding in order to ensure that funds are being spent on data-based priority issues. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | X |
| | Based on the analysis of data and SEA capacity, the WDE develops and disseminates RFPs for coaches, contract monitors, and consultants as needed. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | Seek supplemental funding from federal and foundation sources to support TA/PD and other improvement activities. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | | |
| Data | Engage in data validation activities to ensure the validity and reliability of data submitted by districts. Upon submission of district data, business rules are applied to ensure district data is accurate. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| | Provide annual technical assistance to districts around the collection and analysis of data | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | X |
| | Conduct annual statewide data drilldown with all Division staff and consultants in order to develop priority issues for monitoring, TA/PD, and other APR improvement activities; and to make data-based decisions regarding the effectiveness of current monitoring, TA/PD, and APR improvement activities. Develop or enhance improvement activities based on the results. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Policy | As needed, promulgate state regulations, and develop and disseminate state policies, to ensure compliance with the provisions of the IDEA and state law. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | As needed, develop and disseminate model IEP forms and model local policies to ensure compliance with the IDEA and state law. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | Approve those local policies that comply with the IDEA and state law, and ensure the correction and ultimate approval of those submitted local policies that do not | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

| | Revised SPP Improvement Strategies | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| | initially comply with the requirements of federal and state law. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Interface effectively with the state legislature and the Governor's office to increase the probability that legislation enhances the ability of public agencies to comply with the IDEA. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Dispute Resolution | Ensure the competence of hearing officers, mediators, and IEP Facilitators through effective training. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | |
| | Evaluate annually the effectiveness of the process and analyze the substance and outcomes of hearings, complaint resolutions, and mediations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | |
| | Encourage parents and LEAs to engage in early dispute resolution activities such as facilitated IEP meetings and mediations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | |
| Incentives and Sanctions | Develop determinations formula each year that includes both compliance and performance indicators, and issue determinations to districts annually based upon the formula. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | Ensure the availability of high-quality TA/PD opportunities for all "needs assistance" districts. Ensure that all districts that need intervention or need substantial intervention participate in high-quality TA/PD activities. | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | X |
| | Ensure the correction of noncompliance discovered through data analysis, monitoring, and complaint resolution activities within one year through the development and full implementation of corrective action plans. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| | If any public agencies do not correct noncompliance within one year, ensure correction as soon as possible thereafter through the development and full implementation of compliance agreements and the assignment of coaches to assist these public agencies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| | Intervene as soon as possible, with sanctions if necessary, when evidence indicates that CAPs or compliance agreements are not being implemented fully and/or effectively | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| nce / Professional Development | Develop and disseminate guidance documents regarding compliance, performance, and the connection between the two. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| | Hold at least one annual, multi-day PD event on | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | X |

| | Revised SPP Improvement Strategies | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| | compliance- and performance-related topics with national experts as presenters. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Implement statewide initiatives or TA/PD projects. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | X |
| | Provide targeted TA to LEAs based on determinations and/or monitoring and/or complaint findings. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X |
| | Hold monthly TA/PD conference calls on compliance- and performance-related topics. Disseminate PPT presentations in advance of these conference calls. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X |
| Monitoring | Based on the statewide data drilldown, create monitoring selection formula annually to guide the selection of LEAs within population groups for performance-based monitoring and desk audits. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | X | | X | | | | | | |
| | During pre-staffing process, drill data down to determine potential compliance issues affecting the performance of students with disabilities. Create compliance hypotheses and purposeful samples of students. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| | As warranted by evidence gathered on site, make individual, systemic, and substantive findings of noncompliance in monitoring reports. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| | Ensure the competence of staff and contractual monitors through TA/PD activities. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | X |
| | After implementation of CAPs or compliance agreements, engage in verification monitoring to determine the current compliance status of all prior findings of noncompliance. For systemic findings, in order to make certain that noncompliance was fully corrected, ensure that purposeful samples of students include both students who were in the original samples and students who were not. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| | Use desk audit process to monitor compliance with Indicators 3b, 5c, 11 and 13. | | | X | | X | | | | | | X | | X | | | | | | | |

| | FFY 2010 APR Improvement Activities | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | |
| Fiscal | F-1. WDE reviews monthly district draw downs to verify funds are utilized in a timely manner. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | X | | X | | X | | | | | | | |
| | F-2. On a quarterly basis, districts must submit periodic expenditure reports, which are reviewed to ensure alignment with approved district activities. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | X | | X | | X | | | | | | | |
| | F-3. Contracts were awarded to qualified individuals and agencies in the areas of monitoring, data analysis, legal, technical assistance, professional development, dispute resolution, and accessibility. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | F-4. Complete the grant application process for the SPDG. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| | F-5. Staffing levels are reviewed through various fiscal reports to identify potential shortages of necessary personnel. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Data | D-1. WDE requested files from all districts and reviewed 26 elements, in each file, to determine the accuracy of the data submitted to the SEA. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| | D-2. Plan and hold regional data share-outs for all districts to increase understanding the implications of local data and how to use data to ensure the provision of FAPE in the LRE and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | X | |
| | D-3. Presentation on drilling down data, identifying compliance concerns and generating solutions was added to the agenda at the Special Education Leadership Symposium. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | X | |
| | D-4. Participated in Webinars regarding 618 data tables, specifically Table 8. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| | D-5. Utilized the Online training modules that have been released on the ideadata.org website. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| | D-6. Participated in EIMAC. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| | D-7. EdFacts/OSEP data collection crosswalks. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| | D-8. Conference calls with data partners facilitated by Partner Support Contractors (PSC). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Policy | P-1. Developed, updated, and adopted State policies and procedures for special education. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| | P-2. Developed model policies for districts, aligned to the updated State policies and procedures. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| | P-3. Gathered stakeholder input on forms revisions. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | | | |

| | FFY 2010 APR Improvement Activities | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| | P-4. Modified model IEP forms based on stakeholder input. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | |
| | P-5. Offered testimony regarding State level fiscal support. | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | |
| | P-6. Offered testimony regarding the implications of seclusion and restraint legislation to special education. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| | P-7. Participated in the Wind River Children’sTriad, a partnership between the WDE, WRIR school districts, and many tribal agencies representing the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho tribes to develop educational policies and seek to improve outcomes for children on the reservation. | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| | P-8. Negotiated new MOU with the BHD to ensure effective implementation of Part B regulations in preschools. | | | | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Dispute Resolution | DR-1. Provided pre-session specifically designed for hearing officers at WDE Special Education Leadership Symposium. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | |
| | DR-2. All dispute resolution specialists participate in TAESE work groups around dispute resolution. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | X | X | X | |
| | DR-3. A session on early dispute resolution was included in the WDE Special Education Leadership Symposium. | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | X | X | | | | |
| Incentives and Sanctions | IS-1. Provide training and disseminate TA documents to districts on determinations process. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | X |
| | IS-2. Districts in the Needs Intervention determination category were encouraged to attend a wide variety of professional development and technical assistance opportunities, including the Leadership Symposium and monthly TA calls. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| | IS-3. In order to support districts clearing of noncompliance, the WDE monitors the completion and execution of CAP activities through quarterly meetings with district administration. | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | |
| | IS-4. Met monthly with the monitoring/TA teams to review progress on all CAPs and compliance agreements, establish plans to address areas of concern, and plan to provide additional resources or training. | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | |
| | IS-5. WDE works with districts that have not corrected within the one-year timeline to establish a compliance | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | |

| | FFY 2010 APR Improvement Activities | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | |
| | agreement for clearing the remaining areas of noncompliance. SEA staff meetings with these districts on a monthly basis not support them in completion of these activities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | IS-6. Districts who have failed to clear area of noncompliance are assigned a coach to facilitate the process. | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| | IS-7. Based on the outcomes of the quarterly/monthly meetings, the WDE may require additional technical assistance, increased coaching, or other steps and may direct the district to use funds for completion of these activities. | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| Technical Assistance / Professional Development (TA/PD) | TA/PD-1. Created guidance document on LRE decision making as a result of LRE data around ED, CD, MU | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-2. Provided access to all guidance documents via the web. | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-3. The WDE held a three-day education leadership conference. Sessions targeted the following areas: data-based management for special education directors, LRE, child find, progress monitoring, discipline, transition, dropout prevention, comprehensive evaluations, ESY, early dispute resolution, child find in residential placements, Rtl, PBIS, wrap around, court ordered placements, student engagement, literacy, assistive technology and accessible instructional materials. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | TA/PD-4. The WDE Special Programs Division and other WDE Divisions collaborated to plan and host Wyoming's first annual Native American Education Conference on the Wind River Reservation. | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-5. Increase WDE staff knowledge around literacy, to prepare for future literacy project. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-6. Added 5 schools to PBIS/Rtl cohort. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-7. Developed an online TA request and data information site for the schools participating in the PBIS/Rtl initiative. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-8. Opened PBIS/Rtl trainings to districts that were not yet implementing, but exploring these processes. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-9. Evaluated district performance data aligned to | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | |

| | FFY 2010 APR Improvement Activities | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| | monthly TA calls and required that district staff attend those pertinent TA sessions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-10. Depending on the content of their CAP/compliance agreement, districts were provided with specially designed, on site TA from WDE staff. | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-11. Depending on the content of their CAP/compliance agreement, districts were required to attend or attain specific PD or TA. | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-12. Met with entire division staff on monthly basis to review data, communications, training results, etc of struggling districts and to utilize this information to plan additional supports and guide visits to and other interactions with those districts. | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-13. TA calls were held on the following subjects: Child Find and Comprehensive Evaluation, PLAAFP and Measureable Goals, Services as a Component of FAPE, Educational Benefit is the Hallmark of FAPE, IDEA Requirements for Behavior and Discipline, and Additional FAPE Considerations: ESY and AT. | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-14. Contract with PIC to disseminate information to parents regarding effective involvement in the IEP process. | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TA/PD-15. Provide training to PIC and Uplift on access to the dispute resolution processes, including early dispute resolution. | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | |
| | TA/PD-16. Provide student-specific technical assistance to teams working with students with low incidence disabilities. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | M-1. Based on the areas of concern identified through the statewide data drilldown, a district selection formula had two components: the gap in reading performance of students with disabilities and without disabilities, over time; and the self containment rate of students with multiple disabilities, cognitive disabilities or emotional disabilities. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| | M-2. Investigated hypothesis regarding the provision of FAPE for students with HI, BI, VI, and MU during all onsite district monitoring visits. | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| | M-3. The WDE has implemented an ongoing training process, which includes intensive training for new monitors, a multi-day training for all monitors and | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | | | X | X | X | | | | | |

| FFY 2010 APR Improvement Activities | Indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| monthly training during pre-staffing activities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M-4. Implemented a calibration process to ensure interrater reliability in the Indicator 13 file review process. | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| M-5. WDE solidified a procedural manual to maintain consistency around self-assessment and desk audit processes. | | | | | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | | X |
| M-6. WDE staff attended and presented at the OSEP MEGA Leadership Conference. | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | X | | | | | |
| M-7. WDE staff participated in each of the monthly MSIP technical assistance teleconferences. | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | X | | | | | |
| M-8. WDE staff participated in the Mountain Plains RRC multi-state conference regarding evaluating improvement activities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| M-9. WDE staff held multiple conference calls and meetings with OSEP Team Lead and State Contact regarding OSEP verification visit and necessary corrective action steps. | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | X | | | | | |