

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2010-11**

WYOMING



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2010-11 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

WY SS 21-2-304: By rule and regulation and in consultation and coordination with local school districts, (the Wyoming State Board of Education, SBE), prescribe uniform content and performances standards.

In the SBE rules and regulations, the SBE must review the content and performance standards every 5 years. In 2009 the WDE established a steering committee with representatives of Wyoming stakeholders. Most of the content committees consist of content specialists from elementary through university level participants, as well as community members. Prior to SBE approval for the standards the content committees enlisted a wider group of content specialists and stakeholders for feedback.

SBE, through the Wyoming Department of Education, is currently engaged in a two phase standards review process. Content committees, under the direction of WDE, have reviewed and revised the standards in the areas of language arts (including reading, writing, listening and speaking) and mathematics. The SBE has reviewed and agreed to adopt the standards. Currently a public comment period is taking place (45 days). After the public comment period the WDE will review and consider the comments, then present the completed standards to the SBE for final adoption, expected to take place in the spring of 2012. If final adoption takes place, the standards will be implemented at the classroom level in the SY 2012-2013. Assessment items will begin to reflect the new standards in the 2013-2014 administration.

The science content area will begin the standards review in February of 2012 using the same process described for phase one. This phase is scheduled for approximately 18 months, with final adoption of the second phase content standards scheduled for November of 2013. There would be an implementation period of approximately 12 - 18 months following final adoption, (SY 2013 -2014) with assessment items expected to appear on the 2014-2015 test administration.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At legislative initiative, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) has removed the writing portion of the statewide assessment system for the spring 2012 administration - pending legislative action in the 2012 legislative session on if to re-institute the writing assessment in future years.

The removal of writing affects both the general assessment population and the alternate assessment population.

The removal of the writing assessment will have consequences for reporting AYP. For the 2011 administration of the statewide assessment, writing contributed 40% of the achievement score component of AYP and reading contributed 60%. For the spring 2012 reading will contribute 100% to the achievement portion of the AYP calculation.

WDE is in the process of re-running spring 2011 achievement data to estimate the possible impact that will be seen for the spring 2012 administration.

The remainder of the statewide assessment system (PAWS), is not impacted by the removal of writing and will experience no changes between the 2011 administration and the 2012 administration.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	29.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	71.0
Comments: Nothing at this time	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>No</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No Response</u>
Comments: Nothing at this time	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	52,790	49,835	94.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,570	1,505	95.9
Asian	386	365	94.6
Black or African American	581	551	94.8
Hispanic or Latino	6,467	6,196	95.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	72	67	93.1
White	42,867	40,348	94.1
Two or more races	847	803	94.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,379	6,563	88.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,401	1,395	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	19,228	18,243	94.9
Migratory students	119	114	95.8
Male	27,243	25,666	94.2
Female	25,547	24,169	94.6
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30th 2011			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,542	23.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,629	70.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	435	6.6
Total	6,606	
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30th 2011		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	54,234	51,282	94.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,764	1,708	96.8
Asian	444	423	95.3
Black or African American	596	568	95.3
Hispanic or Latino	7,580	7,312	96.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	70	93.3
White	42,922	40,393	94.1
Two or more races	853	808	94.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,655	6,857	89.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,764	2,757	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,419	19,447	95.2
Migratory students	155	150	96.8
Male	28,046	26,456	94.3
Female	26,188	24,826	94.8

Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30th 2011

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,545	23.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,631	70.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	435	6.6
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	6,611	

Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30th 2011

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	25,906	19,101	73.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	684	536	78.4
Asian	200	156	78.0
Black or African American	272	194	71.3
Hispanic or Latino	3,042	2,379	78.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	22	68.8
White	21,286	15,520	72.9
Two or more races	390	294	75.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,335	2,381	71.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	569	562	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	8,477	6,502	76.7
Migratory students	47	39	83.0
Male	13,259	9,786	73.8
Female	12,647	9,315	73.7

Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30th 2011

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	551	21.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,796	70.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	218	8.5
Total	2,565	

Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30th 2011

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,705	5,931	88.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	236	163	69.1
Asian	45	44	97.8
Black or African American	77	61	79.2
Hispanic or Latino	905	743	82.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	7	63.6
White	5,323	4,819	90.5
Two or more races	108	94	87.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,013	726	71.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	329	232	70.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,721	2,294	84.3
Migratory students	13	10	76.9
Male	3,476	3,093	89.0
Female	3,229	2,838	87.9
Comments:			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,699	4,391	65.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	236	85	36.0
Asian	45	37	82.2
Black or African American	77	44	57.1
Hispanic or Latino	898	448	49.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	5	50.0
White	5,325	3,711	69.7
Two or more races	108	61	56.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,014	332	32.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	322	96	29.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,716	1,485	54.7
Migratory students	13	4	30.8
Male	3,473	2,214	63.7
Female	3,226	2,177	67.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not tested in grade 3 in Wyoming. We only test grade 4, 8 and 11 in Science.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,595	5,359	81.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	214	112	52.3
Asian	45	42	93.3
Black or African American	66	49	74.2
Hispanic or Latino	903	649	71.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	6	75.0
White	5,236	4,409	84.2
Two or more races	123	92	74.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	998	589	59.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	248	141	56.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,607	1,973	75.7
Migratory students	19	14	73.7
Male	3,384	2,755	81.4
Female	3,211	2,604	81.1
Comments:			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,590	5,525	83.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	215	122	56.7
Asian	44	40	90.9
Black or African American	66	53	80.3
Hispanic or Latino	900	664	73.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	6	75.0
White	5,234	4,539	86.7
Two or more races	123	101	82.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	998	544	54.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	242	108	44.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2,602	2,015	77.4
Migratory students	19	12	63.2
Male	3,383	2,747	81.2
Female	3,207	2,778	86.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,590	3,606	54.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	214	36	16.8
Asian	45	28	62.2
Black or African American	66	23	34.8
Hispanic or Latino	902	368	40.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	3	37.5
White	5,232	3,092	59.1
Two or more races	123	56	45.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	997	331	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	248	44	17.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,603	1,152	44.3
Migratory students	19	9	47.4
Male	3,382	1,829	54.1
Female	3,208	1,777	55.4
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,655	5,219	78.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	212	124	58.5
Asian	41	34	82.9
Black or African American	83	46	55.4
Hispanic or Latino	861	573	66.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	5	50.0
White	5,317	4,335	81.5
Two or more races	131	102	77.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	969	461	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	188	74	39.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,563	1,790	69.8
Migratory students	15	8	53.3
Male	3,475	2,728	78.5
Female	3,180	2,491	78.3
Comments:			

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,652	5,132	77.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	212	111	52.4
Asian	40	36	90.0
Black or African American	83	48	57.8
Hispanic or Latino	855	562	65.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	6	60.0
White	5,321	4,265	80.2
Two or more races	131	104	79.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	971	372	38.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	183	65	35.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,561	1,752	68.4
Migratory students	15	8	53.3
Male	3,474	2,585	74.4
Female	3,178	2,547	80.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not tested in grade 3 in Wyoming. We only test grade 4, 8 and 11 in Science.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,636	5,352	80.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	203	128	63.1
Asian	53	47	88.7
Black or African American	73	48	65.8
Hispanic or Latino	811	582	71.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9	7	77.8
White	5,388	4,463	82.8
Two or more races	99	77	77.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	927	479	51.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	141	74	52.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,494	1,822	73.1
Migratory students	23	16	69.6
Male	3,488	2,797	80.2
Female	3,148	2,555	81.2
Comments:			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,636	5,385	81.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	204	131	64.2
Asian	52	45	86.5
Black or African American	73	50	68.5
Hispanic or Latino	809	594	73.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9	6	66.7
White	5,390	4,482	83.2
Two or more races	99	77	77.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	929	383	41.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	137	58	42.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,493	1,833	73.5
Migratory students	22	16	72.7
Male	3,490	2,680	76.8
Female	3,146	2,705	86.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not tested in grade 3 in Wyoming. We only test grade 4, 8 and 11 in Science.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,624	4,914	74.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	223	106	47.5
Asian	47	43	91.5
Black or African American	75	49	65.3
Hispanic or Latino	821	507	61.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	6	60.0
White	5,333	4,120	77.3
Two or more races	115	83	72.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	909	293	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	152	66	43.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,386	1,525	63.9
Migratory students	21	7	33.3
Male	3,375	2,479	73.5
Female	3,249	2,435	74.9
Comments:			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,617	4,662	70.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	223	110	49.3
Asian	44	33	75.0
Black or African American	75	52	69.3
Hispanic or Latino	817	472	57.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	3	30.0
White	5,333	3,918	73.5
Two or more races	115	74	64.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	909	241	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	145	39	26.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,378	1,405	59.1
Migratory students	21	9	42.9
Male	3,370	2,233	66.3
Female	3,247	2,429	74.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not tested in grade 3 in Wyoming. We only test grade 4, 8 and 11 in Science.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,442	4,564	70.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	190	80	42.1
Asian	52	42	80.8
Black or African American	70	28	40.0
Hispanic or Latino	752	404	53.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6	5	83.3
White	5,273	3,937	74.7
Two or more races	99	68	68.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	754	199	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	131	32	24.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,188	1,289	58.9
Migratory students	11	8	72.7
Male	3,288	2,309	70.2
Female	3,154	2,255	71.5
Comments:			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,449	4,976	77.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	189	99	52.4
Asian	52	45	86.5
Black or African American	69	40	58.0
Hispanic or Latino	754	467	61.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6	5	83.3
White	5,280	4,246	80.4
Two or more races	99	74	74.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	754	241	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	130	43	33.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,189	1,490	68.1
Migratory students	11	6	54.5
Male	3,290	2,406	73.1
Female	3,159	2,570	81.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,430	3,253	50.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	189	39	20.6
Asian	52	29	55.8
Black or African American	69	18	26.1
Hispanic or Latino	753	245	32.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6	4	66.7
White	5,262	2,868	54.5
Two or more races	99	50	50.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	751	101	13.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	130	13	10.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,181	843	38.7
Migratory students	11	3	27.3
Male	3,280	1,632	49.8
Female	3,150	1,621	51.5
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,173	6,110	60.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	224	86	38.4
Asian	81	61	75.3
Black or African American	109	39	35.8
Hispanic or Latino	1,112	480	43.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	8	61.5
White	8,506	5,354	62.9
Two or more races	128	82	64.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	978	175	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	121	19	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,522	1,153	45.7
Migratory students	10	3	30.0
Male	5,178	3,177	61.4
Female	4,995	2,933	58.7
Comments:			

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,150	7,110	70.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	232	127	54.7
Asian	79	55	69.6
Black or African American	110	60	54.5
Hispanic or Latino	1,110	633	57.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	9	69.2
White	8,479	6,122	72.2
Two or more races	127	104	81.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	991	258	26.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	120	19	15.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,528	1,479	58.5
Migratory students	10	2	20.0
Male	5,154	3,335	64.7
Female	4,996	3,775	75.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	5,976	2,912	48.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	124	28	22.6
Asian	49	26	53.1
Black or African American	59	12	20.3
Hispanic or Latino	643	176	27.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	3	37.5
White	5,021	2,625	52.3
Two or more races	72	42	58.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	604	68	11.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	67	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	1,387	484	34.9
Migratory students	7	0	
Male	3,072	1,494	48.6
Female	2,904	1,418	48.8
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	348	324	93.1
Districts	48	46	95.8
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30, 2011			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	181	167	92.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	87	78	89.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	94	89	94.7
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30, 2011			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
48	46	95.8
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30, 2011		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	11
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30, 2011	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: Data for this section will be submitted no later than December 30, 2011	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. **(This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The technical assistance provided varies depending on district/school needs. While Wyoming's small educational population would like one-on-one contact with Regional Contacts, distances pose obstacles. Therefore, the District Support and Coordination Team supports Districts and district/schools as they develop and implement their district/school improvement plans through email, phone, WEN and Webinars as well as on-site visits. If the district needs are determined to be at Level III, a WDE coach is assigned to work with the district leadership team. The coach helps the district develop Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) forms for 60-day periods to guide their work in partnership to improve school improvement efforts.

In 2008-2009, the WDE began offering Organizational Assessments (OA) at the District level. This assessment is a process of gathering and analyzing information collected from various stakeholders to assess a District's performance from a systems perspective. The assessment instrument consists of 7 core components and 26 elements. The instrument is research-based and modeled after the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award as well as various state awards. The DSC Team has been trained in this process and will be conducting OA's for Districts across the State. There will be a continued "systems" focus in Districts in the technical assistance that will be provided.

The districts have been the 10% set aside for professional development in a variety of areas, all with the ultimate intent of improving student achievement. Some examples are:

- School and district level leadership have focused on to provide an aligned model of leadership behaviors and practices that have a significant impact on student learning.
- Training has been provided in formative assessment that is used to measure progress on essential skills and guide instruction
- Teachers and coaches have received training on research based strategies that have been identified that support and cause student learning
- In an effort to monitor the implementation of the strategies principals will be trained to implement classroom walk-throughs which will provide teachers with formative feedback to guide instructional planning and delivery
- Continued instruction in the development of assessment and data interpretation has also been a part of the district professional development efforts
- Discipline and management strategies have been an area of focus to improve student achievement
- Implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model
- Curriculum alignment working and training

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: Because of Wyoming's 2009-2010 PAWS difficulty, and the concern surrounding how the results would be used, requested and received a waiver from the US Department of ED on 11-6-10. This waived the statutory and regulatory requirements of Section 1116(c)1)(A) allowing Wyoming schools to maintain their 2009-2010 School Improvement status.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	3	0
Schools	5	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	07/12/11
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

--

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming has a SIG coach dedicated to our 11 schools who provides technical assistance in all areas of the grant, visits the schools regularly and meets with the Program manager and Grant Evaluator monthly. Our Grant evaluator visits the schools, analyzes their data and determines the schools of changes to be made and steps to be taken to recommend continued funding. The Program Manager is in contact with the schools continually, reading the grants, approving or changing amendments, providing trainings and meeting with and coordinating the coach and evaluator. Wyoming is using CII to training all of the schools, coach, evaluator and program manager on Indistar and will be using that tool in evaluation and to inform needed technical assistance.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2010-11 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Wyoming SOSS has had coaches working with schools in improvement statewide using state funds. In 2010-2011 the District SOSS provided technical assistance in guiding districts to help their own schools' improvement efforts. Everyone at the Wyoming Department of Education provides some form of TA. WDE has access to supportive partners like McREL, who has done a study throughout the state that surfaced to guide WDE technical assistants to improve the relevance, responsiveness, and quality of its services to Wyoming schools, districts, and educators. The Northwest Regional Comp Center (NWRCC) in Portland, Oregon helps us with services to better deliver Statewide Systems of Support (SSOS). A wide selection of consultants and experts are available to WDE staff to access services, reports, research, and other resources that help us build the capacity of districts to better serve Wyoming students. CII, Center for Innovation and Improvement is helping Wyoming towards our goal of using Indistar for all of our schools in improvement. The technical assistance provided varies depending on district/school needs. While Wyoming's small educational population would like one-on-one contact with Regional Contacts, distances pose obstacles. Therefore, the SOSS supports Districts and district/schools as they develop and implement their district/school improvement plans through email, phone, WEN and Webinars as well as on-site visits. If the district needs are determined to be at Level III, a WDE coach is assigned to work with the district leadership team. The coach helps the district develop and guide their work in partnership to improve school improvement efforts.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	153
Applied to transfer	43
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	43
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 18,559

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	7

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	2,290
Applied for supplemental educational services	31
Received supplemental educational services	31
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 47,750
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	19,567	19,267	98.5	300	1.5
All elementary classes	3,203	3,184	99.4	19	0.6
All secondary classes	16,364	16,083	98.3	281	1.7

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full day self-contained classroom equals one class at the elementary level.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	35.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	65.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	40.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	60.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	731	725	99.2
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	730	725	99.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,623	2,594	98.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	4,860	4,767	98.1

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	50.1	28.8
Poverty metric used	Students qualifying for free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	44.8	26.3
Poverty metric used	Students qualifying for free and reduced lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>No Response</u>	Two-way immersion	Not Applicable
<u>No Response</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Not Applicable
<u>No Response</u>	Developmental bilingual	Not Applicable
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Arapaho or Shoshone
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No Response</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	1,982
Comments: All LEP in state should be 2486.	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2,018
Comments: LEP students in the state who received services should be 2800.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	1,789
Chinese	19
Arabic	17
Korean	8
Chinook jargon	7

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,603
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	59
Total	2,662
Comments: This number will change based upon the number in 1.6.2.1.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,262
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	63.7
Comments: This number of students who attained proficiency is 331.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,020
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	38
Total	2,058
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	514

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	1,262	83.8		
Attained proficiency	340	16.8		
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: Wyoming does not give any content tests in any other languages.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments: Wyoming does not give any content tests in other languages.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
129	215	344

Comments:

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
223	146	65.5	77

Comments:

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
224	134	59.8	90
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
83	23	27.7	60
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	10
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	10
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	3

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
383	383	

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b) (5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	49
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	19

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on average increase project out five years.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	11	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	7	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	6	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7	
Other (Explain in comment box)	3	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	10	695
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	57
PD provided to principals	11	43
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	8	11
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	6	221
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	46	1,027

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other PD programs that have been used are history of native education and cultural sensitivity and technology in the ELL classroom.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/1/10	07/31/10	30
Comments: Districts must complete their application and receive approval prior to being able to draw funding.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We open GMS for our Districts in June, receive our funds from USED July 1, next year we will try to get the final allocations loaded by July 21.
--

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: Wyoming does not have any persistently dangerous schools	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	44.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	80.0
Hispanic	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	83.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	62.9
Limited English proficient	54.6
Economically disadvantaged	65.3
Migratory students	73.7
Male	78.4
Female	82.5
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates 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 Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	16.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	10.5
Hispanic	7.4
White, non-Hispanic	4.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7.3
Limited English proficient	8.7
Economically disadvantaged	7.7
Migratory students	2.4
Male	5.7
Female	4.4
Comments: Asian = 1.34% Pacific Islander = 2.78%	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	42	42
LEAs with subgrants	6	6
Total	48	48
Comments:		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3	6
K	31	48
1	31	64
2	26	43
3	30	46
4	25	50
5	16	25
6	18	25
7	23	26
8	22	24
9	19	27
10	18	32
11	31	23
12	54	51
Ungraded	0	0
Total	347	490
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	38	134
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	230	217
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	18	39
Hotels/Motels	61	100
Total	347	490
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	55
1	70
2	45
3	49
4	53
5	28
6	25
7	28
8	28
9	29
10	32
11	25
12	49
Ungraded	0
Total	522
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	55
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	43
Limited English proficient students	27
Comments:	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	42	20
4	63	38
5	28	15
6	35	23
7	39	15
8	37	20
High School	50	26
Comments:		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	42	35
4	63	42
5	28	16
6	35	26
7	39	18
8	37	15
High School	55	17
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23
K	15
1	10
2	5
3	8
4	7
5	9
6	9
7	9
8	5
9	5
10	3
11	5
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	113
Comments:	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Improvements in "beet seed" lessens demand for manual workers; number of new migrnt families does not offset the number of "settling out" families; possible variable affecting one site is the continued search for a recruiter---these situations contributed to the continued decrease in numbers. The decrease is now in its third year, more serious discussions have begun regarding continued participation vs. cost effectiveness of the MEP in the state.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	14
1	9
2	5
3	7
4	7
5	9
6	7
7	7
8	1
9	3
10	1
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	89
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Possibilities that affected the count include, but are not limited to, improvements to the "beet seed" with the result of decreased demand for manual laborers; decrease in number of families traveling into Wyoming because of the cost of such necessities such as food and gas; number of incoming/new families is less than those of families 'settling out'.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming continues to use the COEStar/TROMIK system to compile and generate the Category I and Category II Child Counts for CSPR reporting.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data is collected onto a state Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. Data includes student information (name, birthdate, gender, birthplace; parent/guardian names, and a number assigned by the database), eligibility information (qualifying arrival date, residency date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity(ies)), and school information (enrollment date, withdrawal date). A COE is completed for each student every summer; the previous summer's is kept as a locating tool.

Each program site has a recruiter familiar with the geographic area and its citizens. The recruiters actively recruit from early March through August, while a passive recruiting takes place September through December; communities keep in touch with recruiters of newcomers who may be eligible to qualify for migrant education support. Recruiters visit area schools, churches, stores/businesses, gas stations, social services offices, farms, ranches, NOWCAP, and post flyers/posters in their quest for families and referrals for potentially eligible families. Upon receipt of a referral, the family is visited to verify eligibility and the COE completed as outlined above. The COE copy is kept on site for verification, data from the COE entered into COEStar/TROMIK by the recruiter and/or data entry person and the original sent to the State with the end-of-year reports.

The parents/guardians of all children identified as migrant based upon family information obtained during the interview receive a hard copy of the COE from the recruiter. Data is entered into the COEStar/TROMIK system and a unique identification number is assigned to each student. The software prevents duplication based on student information entered annually. Training is provided annually for data entry personnel to ensure only new students are added yearly. Trainers, recruiters, on-site directors, and most data entry personnel from the sites have had little turnover to date, providing sustainability and continuity.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

On-site computers are downloaded each spring to COEStar/TROMIK for uploading updates while training is taking place with the data entry personnel. As data is submitted into the COEStar/TROMIK system, TROMIK reviewers contact on-site data entry for updated verifications or missing data and eliminate duplicate counts. Upon completion of verifications and other updates, TROMIK submits count sheets to the Wyoming Department of Education for reporting in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Individual on-site technical support was conducted during the 2010-2011 reporting period. This session is being considered to repeat because of the favorable verbal response and feedback obtained from participants.

If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming has used COEStar/TROMIK for several years; the data collection procedures remain, for the most part, unchanged from year to year, category to category, unless so noted from the US Department of Elementary & Secondary Education/Office of Migrant Education.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All interviewed families' children may be entered into the database, but only those who meet the eligibility criteria are counted in the final report. Information is uploaded into COEStar/TROMIK by recruiters/data entry personnel, checked and approved by on-site program directors and submitted to COEStar/TROMIK by means of the software that has filters for the Migrant Education Program eligibility requirements. COEStar/TROMIK conducts further verification and clarification steps before returning the data to the State for reporting purposes.

The on-site program managers keep COE hard copies for their records and send the COE originals to the Wyoming Department of Education Migrant Education Program office. If any COE is in need of correction or clarification, the State program manager contacts individual recruiters/data entry personnel and/or on-site directors to seek corrections. Corrections are entered on both on-site and State copies. Questions that occur on-site sometimes are forwarded to the program manager to discuss possible resolutions.

If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming has used the COEStar/TROMIK system for several years for all counts pertaining to the Migrant Education Program; the same system is used for both Category I and II.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming uses three (3) approaches to verify student eligibility: (1)COEStar/TROMIK system; (2)on-site recruiters and reviewers; and, (3)the State program manager. The COEStar/TROMIK Performance Reporter scans databases, locates eligible COEs for the federal reporting, and tabulates the data into reports so that COEStar/TROMIK users may complete the federal report. COEStar/TROMIK selects all COEs that show eligibility for part, or all, of the performance report period. Each child's record in the superset is tested for the following:

*Current Resident of the State of Wyoming

*Qualifying Arrival Date

*Candidates who become 22 years of age during the year

*Departure Date

*Residency Date

*Enrollment Date

*Withdrawal Date

*Compares 3-21 year olds with birth-21 year olds for identification; there is a new COE on each child each summer/year

*Gender and Race/Ethnicity

*Participation in School-wide Programs

*Participation by Grade and Term

*Program Services

*Instructional Services

*Support Services

The on-site data entry personnel and state office personnel handling the Migrant Education Program have been trained, and will continue to be trained and updated, regarding the capacity of running analysis reports on data to locate possible duplication, eligibility, misinformation, and/or other problems. These tasks are on-going through the summer sessions and are completed at the close of each migrant summer session prior to final data transmission to COEStar/TROMIK to verify accuracy. The Wyoming Department of Education is notified of any irregularities that need addressed from the state level. The state program manager is responsible for addressing inconsistencies.

Records are filtered again to obtain a non-duplicated list of participants between the ages of 3 and 21 years, inclusive. Wyoming ensures, through the use of the database, that it does not count children who are below the age of 22, but are no longer eligible for the Migrant Education Program because they have graduated high school.

The question of ID&R has been raised. The ID&R in Wyoming has been obtained through word of mouth, posters/flyers posted, visits to previous employing farm/ranches to talk with families, visits and talks with businesses in town and surrounding areas. As for monitoring, the on-site directors verify and sign the COEs; if there are questions or any hint of a concern, both on-site director and recruiter visit the family---usually separately. Evaluated for effectiveness is accomplished by on-site directors and self-evaluations by each recruiter. Both site directors and recruiters talk with the state director at the data entry training and during the summer sessions to discuss any questions, concerns, or irregularities. Communication methods include phone calls, texting, meetings, visits, faxes, and/or email. Because of the small site number(2), there is no handbook, but the creation and development of a handbook is being considered for the future.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming has re-interviewed its participating sites' eligible migrant students and families. Using the "Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing", the re-interviewing questionnaire was developed. Because many of the same questions appear on the COE, after site and state discussions, it was determined both the questionnaire and a COE would be used in an attempt not to confuse the migrant families and to provide them a copy of everything used.

Training on the use of the questionnaire and procedures was held in early July for the participating sites' recruiters, re-interviewers, and site directors. After the training and questions/answers period, the re-interviewers began the job of

scheduling time for re-interviewing to take place. Re-interviewers were individuals who worked with previous MEP summer sessions or rotated from another participating MEP site. The State contracted with these individuals in order to delineate between interviews and re-interviews. The re-interviewers were requested to work around the migrant families' schedules. As was expected, there were refusals to be re-interviewed; however, the majority of non-re-interviewers were "no shows" (after at least three documented attempts), or moving out of the area, either returning to their home district or moving in search of work.

All eligible migrant students and families were contacted, or the attempts made to contact. Please note because of inclement weather (spring thaw and flooding), some families had left the area to find work elsewhere.

The results of the re-interviewing were included in the sites' "end of year" report binders submitted to the State. One hundred thirteen (113) eligible migrant students were listed from the original COEs, thirty (30) were not re-interviewed because of refusal, no-shows after three attempts, or moved; the remaining eighty-three (83) students and their families were re-interviewed and verified.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming has two (2) summer only participating sites; verification, inputting, and updating student data occurs during the programs in the summer sessions or immediately following.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As previously noted, Wyoming's data are checked and cross-checked at the local program level and at the State level through COEStar/TROMIK.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None at this time or none as of this typing.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Wyoming will continue to avail itself of the services of COEStar/TROMIK; the State has submitted a revised Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Service Delivery Plan with Evaluation, and Re-Interviewing Process as per directives received from the United States Department of Elementary and Secondary Education/Office of Migrant Education.