

## Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

49

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

### General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

#### **GENERAL SUPERVISION SYSTEM**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 established a requirement that all states develop and submit to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) a six-year performance plan designed to increase the state's current level of compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the law and to improve the educational and functional outcomes for children with disabilities. As states develop their second State Performance Plan (SPP), OSEP has increased the focus that states must make on improvement of student outcomes through the inclusion of a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This multi-year plan will require states to focus resources and collaborative efforts to address a narrow, data-based area of state concern regarding the performance of children who have disabilities. The SSIP component of the SPP must include baseline data, projected targets, and a comprehensive plan for improving the outcomes of the targeted students. The state will submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) in each of the years following the submission of the SPP, which will inform OSEP and our Wyoming stakeholders on the progress toward meeting those targets.

Since the IDEA reauthorization of 2004, the Wyoming Department of Education, Division of Individual Learning (WDE) has worked to develop, implement, and refine a general supervision system based on the SPP/APR process, one which aligns with both the letter and spirit of IDEA. This process is not merely a vehicle for reporting to OSEP and the public on statewide data, but is also a holistic system of general supervision, which is integrated, robust, and responsive to the data represented in the SPP/APR indicators. In order to fulfill these mandates, the WDE is implementing a system of general supervision that has data at its core – with particular emphasis on data representing student outcomes. The WDE uses a visual representation modelled after a planetary gear set to illustrate the interrelated nature of the system's components (see attachment). In early 2007, the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) identified seven essential components of effective Part B general supervision: Fiscal Management; Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation; Dispute Resolution; Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions; Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development; Integrated Monitoring Activities; and the SPP. In WDE's system, each of these various components both contribute and respond to various facets of state and local data. Additionally, decisions made about particular activities within each component are based upon data, and the effectiveness of the activities within each component are judged by the extent to which data improved.

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

Because the WDE's general supervision system uses data to determine improvement strategies and to measure the effectiveness of these strategies, WDE conducts activities to ensure the data received from Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the Behavioral Health Division of the Wyoming Department of Health (BHD) is accurate and valid. Upon submission of data to WDE, business rules are applied to determine data accuracy. In addition, data are validated as accurate through checking a random sample of student files. WDE provides technical assistance to districts which focuses not only on the collection of data, but also on substantive analysis of data.

In the fall of each year, the State conducts an in-depth analysis of statewide data. During this meeting, the WDE measures the effectiveness of the prior year's efforts and develops new or revises existing activities. This is considered the primary annual activity in the state's general supervision system. As such, all WDE staff members in the Division of Individual

Learning are required to attend, along with external consultants and representatives from other WDE divisions (such as Administration, School Support and Accountability). During this multi-day activity, attendees closely review the most recent data available concerning the performance of students with disabilities across each of the SPP indicators. In addition, the team reviews a multitude of data concerning identification rates, special education and related services, the provision of assistive technology, extended school year, attendance, discipline, poverty, homelessness, and more. Data are disaggregated by a variety of variables including by disability category, environment, statewide assessment performance, age, gender, race and ethnicity.

Throughout the drilldown process, the team identifies areas of troubling performance which could signify potential problems with the provision of FAPE in the LRE or indicate challenges that districts are having around improving outcomes for students with disabilities. In order to prepare for the development of the SSIP, the drilldown activity was utilized as the initial analysis of data for its development. WDE identified groups of students who were less likely to have positive educational outcomes:

- Students identified in the eligibility category of emotional disability have a lower graduation rate than students in other eligibility categories.
- On the state reading assessment, only 10.9% of students identified as having a learning disability are proficient.
- On the state reading assessment, 17.9% of students identified in the eligibility category of other health impairment are proficient.
- 5.7% of students who are removed from the regular classroom environment for between 21% and 60% of their school day are proficient on the state reading assessment.
- When the placement, poverty and eligibility category data were combined, an even greater impact on positive school outcomes was apparent with significant decreases in graduation rates, increased numbers of students dropping out and decreased performance on the state assessment.

A small stakeholder work group was convened and an in-depth data analysis was performed after the broad data analysis. This stakeholder group was comprised of special education directors, special education teachers, parent advocacy group representatives, pre-school administrators, pre-school teachers, legal advocates, and others. The group narrowed their concerns to two major areas:

1. reading performance of students who are removed from the general education environment between 21% and 60% of their school day.
2. reading performance of high school students who are eligible in the disability categories of either emotional disability or other health impairment.

The stakeholders then divided into two groups and completed a root cause analysis exercise, in an attempt to identify the cause(s) of low performance in each area. Information and a survey regarding these two areas of concern were distributed to a wide group of stakeholders, which included parents, special education administrators, parent advocates, staff of the BHD, and others to gain more input on the focus of the SSIP. After reviewing the results of this survey, the infrastructure analysis, and both broad and in-depth data analyses the SSIP focus became the reading performance of students in preschool and early grades who are removed from the general education environment for between 21% to 60% of their school day.

Through the broad analysis of data and subsequent more focused data reviews and analyses with internal and external stakeholders the WDE is able to: 1) target the multi-year SSIP (Indicator 17); 2) note areas of poor performance upon which to focus additional activities during the upcoming school year; and 3) determine whether or not activities undertaken during the prior year have been effective in improving key data related to all indicators, including indicator 17 (SSIP). This ongoing analysis of data allows the WDE to identify topics and audiences for professional development; determine the focus and structure for technical assistance, set monitoring priorities, identify areas in which guidance documents are needed, plan fiscal oversight, and determine staffing needs. Ultimately, evaluation of the effectiveness of each activity and of our SSIP will take place through measuring data changes that have or have not taken place. Thus, all of WDE's general supervision activities begin and end with data regarding student results and outcomes, receipt of FAPE in the LRE, child find, transition, and potential disproportionality.

The WDE is continually refining and improving this system. With the implementation of the SSIP, WDE will be working with stakeholders to make changes to the monitoring, professional development, and technical assistance components of the general supervision system, in order to ensure that they are as effective as possible in supporting improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

## Fiscal

As with all components of the WDE's general supervision system, the fiscal process is data based. The WDE utilizes SPP indicator data as the foundation for managing the IDEA funds allocated to each LEA. The indicator data for each LEA is inputted into the Grants Management System. Districts utilize the indicator data to review and analyze performance and to

create objectives and outline activities that will be implemented. For any indicator in which the LEA did not meet the state target, the district is required to create an objective and activities to improve outcomes in this area, as a condition of Part B funding. LEAs report expenditures by indicator and throughout the course of the grant cycle, WDE staff will monitor expenditures and contact LEAs, if needed, to ensure they are moving forward with the activities they have designed to improve indicator performance.

To ensure accountability in the use of IDEA funds, the WDE conducts fiscal monitoring through the Special Education Accountability Documentation (SEAD) fiscal desk audit. This process occurs on a 3-year rotating cycle with 16 LEAs being reviewed each year. LEAs submit a desk audit to the WDE in the fall, this information is reviewed by the Division of Individual Learning, Fiscal Consultant. If clarification or additional documentation is required, the WDE makes these requests. The fiscal consultant may also conduct a follow-up meeting to answer questions or provide explanation to ensure the LEA understands the documentation being requested. Further documentation, if necessary, is submitted to the WDE. A Fiscal Review letter will be sent to the LEA detailing the results of the fiscal monitoring, unless an on-site visit is warranted. Reasons for this visit may include: missing or incomplete documentation, fiscal concerns, reporting errors, or LEA staff training needs. Upon completion of an on-site visit, the WDE staff meet with the LEA staff to summarize the findings of the visit, a Fiscal Review letter will follow the visit outlining the steps, if any, the LEA must take, including the development of a Corrective Action Plan.

The WDE also utilizes data to align state and federal funds allocated to the SEA in order to address areas of data-based concern. As a result of the annual statewide data analysis and a review of infrastructure/capacity, the WDE develops and disseminates Request for Proposals (RFP) for coaches, contractors and consultants in order to implement improvement activities, ensure monitoring and compliance work is completed and to increase staff knowledge and capacity. In order to meet the needs of the LEAs in the state, WDE also seeks supplemental funding to support technical assistance and professional development activities.

### **Policy**

When needed, WDE promulgates rules, and/or develops state policies to ensure compliance with the provisions of IDEA and Wyoming state law. The WDE has created model IEP forms and model local policies to ensure compliance with IDEA and state law. The WDE reviews these forms annually and based on regulatory changes, data collected through monitoring and technical assistance activities, and input collected from school districts and the BHD, WDE determines whether these forms need to be revised.

In order to increase the likelihood that legislation supports the ability of educational agencies to comply with IDEA, WDE works to communicate and interface with both the Governor's office and the state legislature. Internal communication procedures within WDE and between state agencies allow for timely notification of and response to pending legislative action.

### **Dispute Resolution**

The WDE ensures the competence of its hearing officers, mediators and staff who support dispute resolution activities through regular training. This includes on-site workshops and quarterly phone-based training.

Annually, the WDE evaluates the effectiveness of dispute resolution processes and analyzes data related to the substance and outcomes of all hearings, complaints and mediations. This data is used to inform changes to the dispute resolution processes and is analyzed as part of the WDE annual data analysis activity, which informs the improvement activities the WDE implements to improve student outcomes. Statewide professional development, regional conferences and web-based resources are developed to improve the understanding of parents and educational agencies regarding the IDEA, dispute resolution processes and to increase the use of early dispute resolution strategies.

### **Monitoring**

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

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

With the requirement that states develop monitoring systems designed to identify areas of non-compliance most associated with student outcomes, the WDE redesigned its monitoring system in 2005. Restructuring of the monitoring system also allowed the WDE to utilize data to more effectively allocate resources and operate within an extremely rural environment.

The monitoring system includes the following components: stable and risk-based self-assessment, on-site targeted and on-site random focused monitoring. The indicators of the SPP are used as a guide for this process, with each indicator being assigned to at least one of the components of the system. Data disaggregation is used as a key problem-identifying tool and as a monitoring and self-monitoring tool to aid in the creation of compliance hypotheses by the WDE. The system is designed to balance all SPP indicators with measurable student outcomes and allows for opportunities to examine all other IDEA regulations simultaneously. By designing a system with the four components listed above, the WDE is able to closely monitor both the IDEA requirements which most impact student outcomes and those more procedurally based requirements.

All school districts and the BHD participate in the stable assessment component of the monitoring system, annually. This includes a procedural checklist to measure selected requirements of the regulation, a review of timely and accurate data submission, and post-secondary transition planning file review. The risk-based assessment is a monitoring activity which takes place in selected districts, based on the performance of the district on select indicators: 3B, 4B, 5C, 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Districts and the BHD are required to participate when their data fall outside of a defined range on any of the aforementioned indicators. In general, districts are asked to explain the circumstances which are foundational to lower-than-expected performance and, depending on the response, the district may be asked for additional information or may be required to implement improvement activities.

On-site monitoring activities are structured around key SPP indicators that emphasize student outcomes. A selection formula is developed based on the statewide areas of greatest concern, as identified through the annual statewide data drilldown activity. Prior to an on-site monitoring visit, WDE analyzes district/developmental preschool level data for students with disabilities to determine potential areas of noncompliance that may account for decreased child outcomes.

WDE does not limit this exploration to the focus indicators, but rather explores all available data, including: state assessment results, graduation discipline, placement, related service provision, etc. Based on analysis of these data the WDE creates compliance hypotheses. These are not findings of noncompliance, but areas for further exploration. These hypotheses create the framework for on-site activities and allow the WDE to focus resources toward data-based areas of concern. Samples of student files are selected, purposefully, because those files are more likely to exhibit the hypothesized noncompliance. These files are reviewed using a tool designed to explore the regulatory requirements specific to the hypothesized area of noncompliance. Files that appear to indicate noncompliance remain in the sample for further exploration. However, files that do not appear to have evidence of noncompliance are removed from the sample. The WDE may also review general student records to attain further information about grades, attendance and behavior. When the file review does not alleviate concerns regarding potential noncompliance, the team will conduct interviews of district staff, parents or students. When interviews negate compliance concerns through the provision of details, additional data or insight into a particular situation, the file is removed from the sample. Interview comments may also support findings of noncompliance. If areas of noncompliance are determined to exist during the on-site visit, a report is written, detailing the monitoring process. Following the receipt of the report a Corrective Action Plan is developed outlining a set of activities the LEA/BHD agree to undertake in order to address district practices which resulted in each finding of noncompliance.

On July 30, 2014 the WDE notified OSEP of the results of findings for the 2013-14 monitoring cycle. The single finding of noncompliance (related to BHD Preschool Region 6) required revision to the region's transportation policy, which, at the time of the initial monitoring, set certain geographic conditions in order for students to receive transportation services from

the region. Region 6 revised their transportation policy in May 2014 (refer to attached Wyoming WDE-BHD Region 6 Transportation Policy 5-2014) to say that transportation is available to all children with disabilities, regardless of the geographic location of their home. The WDE verified that the noncompliance had been fully resolved through this policy change.

As mentioned above, with the implementation of the SSIP, the monitoring procedures will be reviewed and improved along with all components of the general supervision to ensure the system works to result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

### **Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions**

The WDE enforces regulations, rules and policies related to IDEA and ensures corrections are made when LEAs and the BHD do not meet these requirements. The WDE utilizes a determinations formula which includes compliance and performance indicators. Determinations are issued annually to LEAs and the BHD. High quality technical assistance activities and resources are made available for districts that need assistance, need intervention or need substantial intervention. The WDE general supervision system ensures correction of noncompliance identified through monitoring and complaint resolution activities, within one year, through the use of corrective action plans. Any noncompliance which is not corrected within one year is corrected as soon as possible through the implementation of compliance agreements designed to provide more intensive and targeted support to the district or BHD.

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

### **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM**

Because of the rural nature of Wyoming, maximizing state and local resources is critical to ensuring improved outcomes for students with disabilities. In order to do this, the WDE uses a holistic, data-based general supervision system, in which the activities of all components of the system are planned to affect change in critical student outcome data. To structure these activities, WDE identifies the broad improvement strategies which can be leveraged to effect these changes. Based on an annual data analysis, specific improvement activities are developed, revised or discontinued to address current needs. This framework not only allows the WDE to be responsive in supporting districts and developmental preschool programs, but also provides the structure for the data-based analysis of the effectiveness of current activities. Improvement strategies have been developed in each area of the general supervision system: fiscal, data, policy, dispute resolution, incentives and sanctions, monitoring and technical assistance/professional development. Following the annual data drilldown activity and subsequent stakeholder input, these strategies are reviewed in order to focus resources from all areas of the general supervision system on the SSIP and on other areas of concern identified during that data analysis.

The improvement strategies that WDE uses to support educational agencies in attaining procedural compliance and increasing outcomes for students with disabilities are designed to affect change in a variety of situations and through the application of a variety of strategies. When areas of data-based concern arise which have statewide effects, guidance documents are developed and disseminated to provide an ongoing resource to which educational agencies can refer. Statewide initiatives are implemented to support districts and developmental preschools in making systemic changes to support the improvement of student outcomes. Web-based presentations and resources may be developed. Access to resources and web-based training is provided through the WDE website. When non-compliance with procedural or outcomes-based components of IDEA or state law are identified based on determinations, monitoring, or complaint findings, the WDE may develop technical assistance training to address district or preschool specific needs. In addition, through the outreach consultants, who support students with visual impairments and students who are deaf or hard of hearing, student level technical assistance is provided to education agencies in support of improved evaluation, IEP development/implementation and instructional supports.

As mentioned above, with the development of a new SPP and implementation of the SSIP, the technical assistance activities will be reviewed and improved along with all components of the general supervision to ensure the system works to result in

improved outcomes for students with disabilities and the use of all possible resources to ensure successful implementation of the SSIP.

**Professional Development System:**

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM**

As outlined in the sections above, the WDE uses a holistic, data-based general supervision system, in which the activities of all components of the system are planned to affect change in critical student outcome data. Broad improvement strategies have been identified, which are used as a framework for the development of more specific improvement activities, which are designed and implemented based on the analysis of data. This analysis structure is also the tool used to determine the effectiveness of ongoing professional development activities and allows WDE to refine or discontinue activities which are not demonstrating effectiveness. Improvement strategies have been developed in each area of the general supervision system, including professional development/technical assistance . Following the annual data drilldown activity these strategies are reviewed and, based on the areas of concern identified during that data analysis the specific improvement activities for the year are identified.

As in all areas of the WDE general supervision system, broad professional development improvement strategies are identified and based on data analysis WDE determines the content, structure and audience for these activities. Professional development improvement strategies include: at least one statewide multi-day conference, collaboration with other adjacent states to maximize resources to address like areas of need, provision of session presentations or content on compliance and performance based topics during statewide or regional professional development activities coordinated by other WDE divisions, state agencies or private entities, and the development of web-based training opportunities to allow easier access to information and training and mitigate some of the challenges that the large size and rural nature of the state create.

As mentioned above, with the development of a new SPP and implementation of the SSIP, professional development activities will be reviewed and improved along with all components of the general supervision to ensure the system results in improved outcomes for students with disabilities and to successfully implement the SSIP.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Division of Individual Learning. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Administrators of Special Education Fall Conference, State Independent Living Council meeting, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. Additional feedback regarding target setting for indicators 6, 7 and 8 was collected through the Behavioral Health Division of the Wyoming Department of Health in meetings with the Wyoming Interagency Council on Early Intervention and Special Education. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

In gathering input for the SSIP, the WDE utilized data from a survey of special education administrators, a needs assessment regarding technical assistance and professional development and the final reports from three Communities of Practice (COP). These COPs focused on challenging transitions in education: transitions into and out of more restrictive placements for students with emotional and behavioral challenges, post-secondary transition, and the transition from an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) to an IEP and from preschool to kindergarten. This stakeholder input data was included in the WDE's annual analysis of special education data. Once the initial data analysis was complete, a small stakeholder group was convened to complete a more in-depth data analysis and to narrow the focus for a possible SSIP. Results of this data analysis were shared with the WAPSD and disseminated along with a survey to special education directors and the WAPSD in order to attain more input on the focus of the SSIP. Once the SSIP and how it would be measured were determined, this information was shared with WAPSD and with special education directors. Based on the selection of the SSIP, surveys were developed to

## **FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

solicit more information on what special education teachers, preschool teachers, related service providers, general education teachers, special education administrators and school administrators believe are the strengths, barriers and challenges in improving the performance of the students identified for focus in the SSIP. In addition, the WDE used regional and district level data analysis activities as an opportunity to share district level data regarding the performance of students in the early elementary grades who spend between 21% and 60% of their time outside the general education environment. Districts analyzed their data in comparison to statewide data and the data of similarly sized districts and provided the WDE with information on barriers, challenges, successes, district level programming and potential improvement activities.

The WDE used statistically sound practices in determining the targets for each indicator carefully accounting for our very small population. Wyoming is considered a frontier state with an exceptionally low population density. The total population of the state during the last census was under 600,000 people. Total public school enrollment was 92,218 in the fall of 2013, with a corresponding special education child count of 12,860. Our largest school district has an enrollment of 13,635 and the smallest district has an enrollment of 94 students. Wyoming's population would be considered only marginally diverse. Three of our smaller school districts are on the Wind River Indian Reservation and have school populations that are 95% Native American, with 70% qualifying for free and reduced lunch.

The draft SPP targets were reviewed with stakeholder groups which included administrators, parents, teachers and related service providers to gather feedback and input. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD. The SSIP draft was disseminated to stakeholder groups of administrators, parents, and teachers in order to elicit further input. This feedback was used to revise the draft and create final documents, which were reviewed by the WAPSD for final input prior to submission to OSEP for approval.

### **Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

### **REPORTING TO THE PUBLIC**

Following the submission of the Wyoming SPP to OSEP, the WDE Division of Individual Learning will post the final version of the SPP on the WDE website and will notify stakeholder groups of this posting. Copies of the SPP will also be provided to local education agencies, developmental preschool programs and any individuals who request a copy. Public notice about the availability of the Wyoming SPP will be made in a press release to Wyoming newspapers, radio and television stations through the reporting process at WDE. These same constituents will be notified of any change determined necessary to the SPP pending OSEP's final approval. WDE will work with the Parent Information Center to facilitate disseminating pertinent information to parents of students with disabilities across the state.

In accordance with 20 U.S.C.1416(b)(C)(ii), the WDE will report annually to the public on the performance of each local educational agency and intermediate education unit on the target in the SPP. The WDE will create an annual draft determinations report for each LEA and the BHD. A report will be issued to each educational agency and posted on the WDE website.

### **OSEP Response**

#### **OTHER COMPLIANCE ISSUES**

##### **FFY 2012 Required Actions:**

The FFY 2012 Response Table required that the WDE submit, within one year of the date that the WDE notifies the BHD/EIEP of any findings of noncompliance made during this monitoring cycle, documentation that it has implemented the procedures it developed to ensure that it has a general supervision system that is designed to ensure correction of identified noncompliance in a timely manner in the BHD/EIEP and the preschool programs operated by the BHD/EIEP.

On July 30, 2014, the WDE submitted to OSEP a copy of the notification to the BHD/EIEP of findings of noncompliance made during the 2013-2014 monitoring cycle, however this documentation does not demonstrate verification of correction of these findings therefore demonstrating that the WDE has a general supervision system that is designed to ensure correction of noncompliance in a timely manner in the BHD/EIEP and the preschool programs operated by the BHD/EIEP.

#### **REQUIRED ACTIONS:**

The WDE must submit, within one year of the date that the WDE notified the BHD/EIEP of the findings of noncompliance made during the 2013-2014 monitoring cycle, documentation that it has implemented the procedures it developed to ensure that it has implemented a general supervision system that is designed to ensure correction of identified noncompliance in a timely manner in the BHD/EIEP and the preschool programs operated by the BHD/EIEP.



**Indicator 1: Graduation****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		48.50%	49.00%	49.00%	49.50%	50.00%	50.50%	51.00%
Data	50.60%	52.10%	59.72% 59.02%	66.29%	66.29%	62.89%	57.20%	58.68% 56.58%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

The rates provided for FFY2007 and FFY2012 were not correct. They did not match Wyoming's official rates. Baseline data is FFY2005.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

These targets align with our ESEA Accountability Workbook. These targets were reviewed with stakeholders.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 1: Graduation****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	554	
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	940	
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	59.00%	Calculate <input type="button" value="Calculate"/>

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
554	940	58.68%	85.00%	59.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions Field**

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The requirements for earning a high school diploma from any school district in the State of Wyoming are as follows:

- The successful completion of four years of English; three years of mathematics; three years of science; three years of social studies. [W.S. §21-2-304(a)(iii)]
- Satisfactorily passing an examination of the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Wyoming. (W.S. §21-9-102)
- Evidence of proficient performance, at a minimum, on the uniform student conduct and performance standards for the common core of knowledge and skills. [W.S. 21-2-304(a)(iii) and (iv)]

Upon the completion of these requirements, a student receives a regular diploma with one of the following endorsements stated on the student's transcript: Advanced Endorsement; Comprehensive Endorsement; or General Endorsement. Beginning with students graduating in 2006 and thereafter, each student must demonstrate proficient performance on five out of the nine content and performance standards for language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, health, physical education, foreign language, career/vocational education and fine and performing arts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 2: Drop Out****Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005 2014

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		13.80%	13.60%	13.60%	13.40%	13.20%	13.00%	12.80%
Data	12.90%	7.70%	7.08%	7.08%	5.52%	7.33%	5.82%	5.72%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**Explanation of Changes**

Baseline data is FFY2005.

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	6.25%	6.20%	6.15%	6.10%	6.05%	6.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Administrators of Special Education Fall Conference, a State Independent Living Council meeting, and a Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 2: Drop Out****FFY 2013 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	416	
SY 2012-13 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	39	
SY 2012-13 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	27	
SY 2012-13 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	200	
SY 2012-13 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	3	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
218	3,588	5.72%	6.25%	6.08%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 **Use a different calculation methodology****Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.**

WDE uses an event rate calculation for drop-out. This rate measures the number of students who dropped out over a 1-year interval.

The numerator: Those students enrolled in grades 10-12 in Year 1, not enrolled October Year 2 and didn't get diploma in Year 1)

The denominator: Numerator plus all persons grade 10-12 in Year 1 still attending Year 2, or graduated in Year 1.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

### Historical Data and Targets

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The WDE is unable to complete the above table due to the manner in which district-level results are calculated in the state of Wyoming. Please see attached document for an explanation and for historical data, targets, and FFY 2013.

The indicator targets you will see in the attached document are aligned with the WDE's ESEA Accountability Workbook.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

FFY 2013 Data

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/4/2014	Number of districts in the State	49	

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?  Yes  No

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
49						Incomplete Data	n/a

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for  
Disability Subgroup**  
**Required Actions from FFY 2012**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 3B: Participation for Students****with IEPs****Reporting Group Selection**

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2013 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Elementary	x	x	x	x								
B	Middle					x	x						
C	HS									x			

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Elementary	2005	Target ≥		100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	95.00%
			Data	98.80%	98.31%	98.20%	99.20%		98.90%	99.26%	99.40%
	B Middle	2005	Target ≥		100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	95.00%
			Data	97.80%	97.26%	97.80%	98.20%		98.60%	99.32%	99.00%
	C HS	2005	Target ≥		100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	95.00%
			Data	95.50%	93.50%	97.20%	97.90%		97.20%	96.30%	92.40%
Math	A Elementary	2005	Target ≥		100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	95.00%
			Data	98.70%	98.73%	97.80%	99.20%		98.80%	99.31%	99.30%
	B Middle	2005	Target ≥		100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	95.00%
			Data	97.90%	97.60%	97.26%	98.10%		98.50%	99.22%	99.00%
	C HS	2005	Target ≥		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.00%
			Data	95.20%	95.25%	93.50%	98.10%	97.30%	97.30%	96.78%	92.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### Explanation of Changes

The 100% and 97.30% that was under FFY2009 for High School should have been under FFY2010.

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Elementary	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Middle	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Elementary	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Middle	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets align with the WDE's ESEA Accountability Workbook.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? no

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade												
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS	
a. Children with IEPs	1227	1220	1137	1035	957	973	0	0	663	0	0	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	493	402	361	218	189	227	0	0	107	0		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	669	743	714	742	679	676	0	0	413	0		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	62	69	57	68	81	61	0	0	74	0		

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade												
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS	
a. Children with IEPs	1228	1220	1137	1035	957	973	0	0	663	0	0	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	488	403	356	228	181	210	0	0	107	0		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	674	742	719	731	686	694	0	0	413	0		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	62	69	57	67	81	61	0	0	74	0		

### OSEP Response

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students

### with IEPs

#### FFY 2013 Data

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Elementary	4,619	4,598	99.40%	95.00%	99.55%	Met Target	No Slippage
B Middle	1,930	1,913	99.00%	95.00%	99.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
C HS	663	594	92.40%	95.00%	89.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of Group C Slippage**

The High School participation rate decrease aligns with the implementation of the ACT as the 11th grade assessment. The number of opportunities to take the assessment are more limited than students taking the elementary and middle school assessments. The WDE is working with school districts to implement strategies to increase participation rates.

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Elementary	4,620	4,596	99.30%	95.00%	99.48%	Met Target	No Slippage
B Middle	1,930	1,913	99.00%	95.00%	99.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
C HS	663	594	92.70%	95.00%	89.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of Group C Slippage**

The High School participation rate decrease aligns with the implementation of the ACT as the 11th grade assessment. The number of opportunities to take the assessment are more limited than students taking the elementary and middle school assessments. The WDE is working with school districts to implement strategies to increase participation rates.

**Public Reporting Information**

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

[http://fusion.edu.wyoming.gov/MySites/Data\\_Reportng/data\\_reportng\\_assessment\\_reports.aspx](http://fusion.edu.wyoming.gov/MySites/Data_Reportng/data_reportng_assessment_reports.aspx).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Reporting Group Selection

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2013 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Elementary	x	x	x	x								
B	Middle					x	x						
C	HS									x			

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State's FFY 2012 historical data for high school reading in this indicator should have been 38.7%. Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2012 data to reflect the correct data as reported in the FFY 2012 response table.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Elementary	2005	Target ≥		42.00%	42.00%	53.60%		53.60%	65.20%	85.40%
			Data	29.50%	37.50%	33.50%	32.20%		43.10%	45.94%	40.90%
	B Middle	2005	Target ≥		45.42%	45.42%	56.33%		56.33%	67.25%	79.70%
			Data	21.30%	28.90%	28.60%	23.50%		31.80%	37.20%	37.90%
	C HS	2005	Target ≥		57.00%	57.00%	56.60%		65.60%	74.20%	34.70%
			Data	19.90%	29.20%	22.90%	24.80%		33.50%	36.56%	38.70% 75.40%
Math	A Elementary	2005	Target ≥		36.50%	36.50%	49.20%		49.20%	61.90%	83.30%
			Data	40.60%	61.60%	51.30%	51.20%		58.50%	59.94%	56.90%
	B Middle	2005	Target ≥		37.75%	37.75%	50.20%		50.20%	62.65%	75.20%
			Data	17.60%	29.60%	33.60%	32.70%		32.30%	34.70%	35.50%
	C HS	2005	Target ≥		46.50%	46.50%	57.20%		57.20%	67.90%	69.50%
			Data	15.10%	19.80%	18.80%	19.90%		25.60%	23.09%	26.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### Explanation of Changes

As per the following OSEP data note: *The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.*

*The State's FFY 2012 historical data for high school reading in this indicator should have been 38.7%. Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2012 data to reflect the correct data as reported in the FFY 2012 response table.*

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Elementary	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	B ≥ Middle	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	C ≥ HS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Math	A ≥ Elementary	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	B ≥ Middle	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	C ≥ HS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Administrators of Special Education Fall Conference, a State Independent Living Council meeting, and a Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State's FFY 2012 historical data for high school reading in this indicator should have been 38.7%. Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2012 data to reflect the correct data as reported in the FFY 2012 response table.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? no

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading proficiency data by grade												
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS	
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1224	1214	1132	1028	949	964	0	0	594	0	0	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	256	209	148	85	61	63			9			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	101	103	106	89	90	85			36			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level												
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level												
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	40	52	46	54	64	52	0	0	52	0	0	

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math proficiency data by grade												
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS	
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1224	1214	1132	1026	948	965	0	0	594	0	0	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	218	154	146	67	43	47			6			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	105	100	115	78	51	73			25			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level												

Math proficiency data by grade												
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS	
level												
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level												
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	51	55	43	56	64	51	0	0	53	0	0	

## OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State's FFY 2012 historical data for high school reading in this indicator should have been 38.7%. Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2012 data to reflect the correct data as reported in the FFY 2012 response table.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### FFY 2013 Data

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Elementary	4,598	1,289	40.90%	100%	28.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B Middle	1,913	415	37.90%	100%	21.69%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C HS	594	97	38.70%	100%	16.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

#### Explanation of Group A Slippage

The WDE changed our state performance standards this year and the resulting changes to the assessments, including more rigorous proficiency expectations, impacted student scores on the state assessment. The impact on students with disabilities mirrors that of all test takers. Because the 2014 PAWS reading test changed significantly from the 2013 PAWS reading test, a set of concordance tables was calculated in order to link the 2014 scores to the 2013 scores. The results of this linkage study show that generally at each grade level achievement remained the same from 2013 and 2014 for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

#### Explanation of Group B Slippage

The WDE changed our state performance standards this year and the resulting changes to the assessments, including more rigorous proficiency expectations, impacted student scores on the state assessment. The impact on students with disabilities mirrors that of all test takers. Because the 2014 PAWS reading test changed significantly from the 2013 PAWS reading test, a set of concordance tables was calculated in order to link the 2014 scores to the 2013 scores. The results of this linkage study show that generally at each grade level achievement remained the same from 2013 and 2014 for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

#### Explanation of Group C Slippage

The WDE changed our state performance standards this year and the resulting changes to the assessments impacted student scores on the state assessment. The impact on students with disabilities mirrors that of all test takers. Because the 2014 PAWS reading test changed significantly from the 2013 PAWS reading test, a set of concordance tables was calculated in order to link the 2014 scores to the 2013 scores. The results of this linkage study show that generally at each grade level achievement remained the same from 2013 and 2014 for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
------------	--	---	----------------	------------------	---------------	--------	----------

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A Elementary	4,596	1,188	56.90%	100%	25.85%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B Middle	1,913	329	35.50%	100%	17.20%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C HS	594	84	26.80%	100%	14.14%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

### Explanation of Group A Slippage

The WDE changed our state performance standards this year and the resulting changes to the assessments impacted student scores on the state assessment. The impact on students with disabilities mirrors that of all test takers. Because the 2014 PAWS mathematics test changed significantly from the 2013 PAWS mathematics test, a set of concordance tables was calculated in order to link the 2014 scores to the 2013 scores. The results of this linkage study show that generally at each grade level achievement remained the same from 2013 and 2014 for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

### Explanation of Group B Slippage

The WDE changed our state performance standards this year and the resulting changes to the assessments impacted student scores on the state assessment. The impact on students with disabilities mirrors that of all test takers. Because the 2014 PAWS mathematics test changed significantly from the 2013 PAWS mathematics test, a set of concordance tables was calculated in order to link the 2014 scores to the 2013 scores. The results of this linkage study show that generally at each grade level achievement remained the same from 2013 and 2014 for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

### Explanation of Group C Slippage

The WDE changed our state performance standards this year and the resulting changes to the assessments impacted student scores on the state assessment. The impact on students with disabilities mirrors that of all test takers. Because the 2014 PAWS mathematics test changed significantly from the 2013 PAWS mathematics test, a set of concordance tables was calculated in order to link the 2014 scores to the 2013 scores. The results of this linkage study show that generally at each grade level achievement remained the same from 2013 and 2014 for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

### Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The public reports of Wyoming statewide assessment participation and proficiency conforming with 34 C.F.R. §300.160(f) can be reviewed at the following URL:  
[http://fusion.edu.wyoming.gov/MySites/Data\\_Reportng/data\\_reportng\\_assessment\\_reports.aspx](http://fusion.edu.wyoming.gov/MySites/Data_Reportng/data_reportng_assessment_reports.aspx)

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State's FFY 2012 historical data for high school reading in this indicator should have been 38.7%. Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2012 data to reflect the correct data as reported in the FFY 2012 response table.

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State's FFY 2012 historical data for high school reading in this indicator should have been 38.7%. Due to a data entry error when the historical data were pre-populated, this was not reflected in the table above. Please revise the FFY 2012 data to reflect the correct data as reported in the FFY 2012 response table.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input****OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/4/2014	Number of districts in the State	49	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data***Please indicate the type of denominator provided* Number of districts in the State Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
0	45	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):** Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The WDE uses the "state bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2013 state rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.63%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.63% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be at least 25 students in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Because Wyoming is reporting that none of its 49 LEAs including the BHD have a significant discrepancy in suspensions or expulsions of more than ten days in a school year by race or ethnicity, the WDE did not review LEA policies, procedures and practices relating to discipline of children with disabilities for this purpose during FFY 2013.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/4/2014	Number of districts in the State	49	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data***Please indicate the type of denominator provided* Number of districts in the State Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	44	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 All races and ethnicities were included in the review**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The WDE uses the "state bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2013 state rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.63%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.63% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be at least 25 students in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged, and all seven race and ethnicity reporting categories are included in this analysis.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 5: Education Environments****(children 6-21)****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥			57.30%	57.40%	57.50%	58.00%	58.50%	60.00%
		Data	54.30%	57.32%	59.60%	60.50%	60.59%	62.27%	60.59%	62.17%
B	2005	Target ≤			9.48%	9.44%	9.39%	9.30%	9.28%	9.25%
		Data	9.15%	8.62%	8.33%	8.38%	8.24%	7.60%	7.10%	7.07%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.44%	2.43%	2.42%	2.41%	2.40%	2.39%
		Data	2.63%	2.76%	2.43%	1.23%	1.39%	1.07%	2.19%	1.44%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	61.84%	62.09%	62.34%	62.59%	62.84%	63.09%
Target B ≤	7.25%	7.10%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	6.75%
Target C ≤	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%	1.33%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Administrators of Special Education Fall Conference, a State Independent Living Council meeting, and a Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 5: Education Environments****(children 6-21)****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE***Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:**

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	11,993	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	7,417	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	850	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	54	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	64	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	43	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	7,417	11,993	62.17%	61.84%	61.84%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	850	11,993	7.07%	7.25%	7.09%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	161	11,993	1.44%	1.34%	1.34%	Met Target	No Slippage

\*FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 5: Education Environments

### (children 6-21)

#### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

#### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								60.34%
		Data							59.84%	60.45%
B	2011	Target ≤								31.30%
		Data							30.80%	30.94%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	61.48%	61.73%	61.98%	62.23%	62.48%	62.73%
Target B ≤	29.01%	28.76%	28.51%	28.26%	28.01%	27.76%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. Additional feedback regarding target setting was collected through the Behavioral Health Division of the Wyoming Department of Health in meetings with the Wyoming Interagency Council on Early Intervention and Special Education. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 6: Preschool Environments****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,258	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,003	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	765	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	178	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,003	3,258	60.45%	61.48%	61.48%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	945	3,258	30.94%	29.01%	29.01%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					60.68%	61.18%	62.18%	
		Data				60.68%	69.72%	69.90%	76.48%	85.37%
A2	2008	Target ≥					56.87%	57.37%	58.37%	
		Data				56.87%	63.00%	58.28%	59.56%	64.21%
B1	2008	Target ≥					61.12%	61.62%	62.62%	
		Data				61.12%	67.13%	74.02%	81.41%	88.22%
B2	2008	Target ≥					54.77%	55.27%	56.27%	
		Data				54.77%	56.60%	55.98%	58.67%	62.45%
C1	2008	Target ≥					63.81%	64.31%	65.31%	
		Data				63.81%	73.07%	75.31%	79.07%	87.55%
C2	2008	Target ≥					67.05%	67.55%	68.55%	
		Data				67.05%	71.26%	71.05%	73.32%	77.66%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	87.50%	87.50%	87.60%	87.70%	87.90%	89.50%
Target A2 ≥	57.13%	57.13%	57.33%	57.53%	57.53%	59.13%
Target B1 ≥	89.27%	89.27%	89.37%	89.47%	89.67%	91.27%
Target B2 ≥	53.72%	53.72%	53.82%	53.92%	54.12%	55.72%
Target C1 ≥	89.18%	89.18%	89.28%	89.38%	89.58%	91.18%
Target C2 ≥	68.55%	68.55%	68.65%	68.75%	68.95%	70.55%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. Additional feedback regarding target setting was collected through the Behavioral Health Division of the Wyoming Department of Health in meetings with the Wyoming Interagency Council on Early Intervention and Special Education. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and

final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

### **OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1,437
--	-------

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	153
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	456
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	664
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	157

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1,120	1,280	85.37%	87.50%	87.50%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	821	1,437	64.21%	57.13%	57.13%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	128
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	530
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	593
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	179

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1,123	1,258	88.22%	89.27%	89.27%	Met Target	No Slippage

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	772	1,437	62.45%	53.72%	53.72%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

### Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	120
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	328
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	694
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	291

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1,022	1,146	87.55%	89.18%	89.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	985	1,437	77.66%	68.55%	68.55%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

See above.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		52.15% 0.00%	52.55% 0.00%	53.55% 0.00%	54.55% 0.00%	56.55% 0.00%		80.35%
Data	51.28% 0.00%	58.60% 0.00%	64.75% 0.00%	68.79% 0.00%	73.45% 0.00%	72.13% 0.00%	79.85% 0.00%	70.71% 70.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### Explanation of Changes

The data were missing for years prior to 2012. For 2012, 70.70% was changed to 70.71%.

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	74.61%	74.89%	75.14%	75.39%	75.64%	75.89%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. Additional feedback regarding target setting was collected through the Behavioral Health Division of the Wyoming Department of Health in meetings with the Wyoming Interagency Council on Early Intervention and Special Education. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
758	1,016	70.71%	74.61%	74.61%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

A representative sample of preschool children and K-12 students is chosen from each preschool region and school district in the state for the Indicator 8 parent survey. Results are weighted according to district/region population size so that the overall state parent involvement percentage is an accurate reflection of the experiences of parents of students with disabilities age 3 to 21. Parents of students at all grade levels respond to the survey.

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the race/ethnicity of the child; (3) by the grade level of the child; and (4) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 37% of the K-12 parents who returned a survey indicated that their children's primary disability is a speech/language impairment, and 38% of PreK-12 special education students have a speech impairment. Furthermore, 82% of parent respondents indicated that their student is white, and 78% of special education students are White. Parents from each district and region responded to the survey. Results were weighted by district/preschool region to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

**Was sampling used?** Yes

**Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?** No

**Was a collection tool used?** Yes

**Is it a new or revised collection tool?** No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

The sampling plan the WDE uses was approved by OSEP in 2008. Sampling is done at the district level. A sample of students with disabilities was randomly selected from each of the 48 Wyoming districts and the Early Intervention and Education Program (EIEP) (the Part B 619 program for preschool students). The number of students chosen was dependent on the number of total students with disabilities at a district and each of the 14 preschool regions with the EIEP as indicated in the table below. The sample sizes selected ensured roughly similar margins of error across the different district sizes.

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

For those districts/regions for which a sample was chosen, the population was stratified by gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and grade level to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample. When calculating the state-level results, responses were weighted by the students with disability population size (e.g., a district/region that has four times the number of students with disabilities as another district will receive four times the weight in computing overall state results). Because the sampling plan is based on a representative sample from each and every district and preschool region and because the proper weighting is done in the analysis, the WDE is assured that the indicator 8 results are valid and reliable.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 9: Disproportionate****Representations****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Historical Data***Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

### FFY 2013 Data

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/4/2014	Number of districts in the State	49	

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

*Please indicate the type of denominator provided*

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	49	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

#### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The Wyoming Department of Education collects the data used for Indicator 9 through the November 1 snapshot data collection. All races and ethnicities are included in the review of Indicator 9. The WDE calculates an Alternate Risk Ratio for each school district in the state, based on the identification rate of each racial/ethnic group in each district. The WDE uses the Alternate Risk Ratio (as defined by OSEP and WESTAT) for determining disproportionate representation because it is most relevant and meaningful for Wyoming's small, rural population.

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

As stated above, the WDE defines disproportionate representation as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above. Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, WDE staff members review the LEAs evaluation policies and procedures in addition to applicable student evaluation records to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### OSEP Response

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate

### Representations

#### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

**Indicator 9: Disproportionate****Representations****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Historical Data and Targets

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### FFY 2013 Data

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
<a href="#">Part B Introduction Page</a>	12/4/2014	Number of districts in the State	49	

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

*Please indicate the type of denominator provided*

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	49	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

#### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The Wyoming Department of Education collects the data used for Indicator 10 through the November 1 snapshot data collection. All races and ethnicities are included in the review of Indicator 10. The WDE calculates an Alternate Risk Ratio for each school district in the state, based on the identification rate of each racial/ethnic group in each district. The WDE uses the Alternate Risk Ratio (as defined by OSEP/WESTAT) for determining disproportionate representation because it is most relevant and meaningful for Wyoming's small, rural population.

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

As stated above, the WDE defines disproportionate representation as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above. Once a ratio is flagged for disproportionate representation, WDE staff members review the LEA's evaluation policies and procedures in addition to applicable student evaluation records to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

### Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations*

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not clarify whether or not all races and ethnicities were included in the review.

**Indicator 11: Child Find****Historical Data and Targets**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.00%	97.00%	87.40%	91.10%	97.30%	98.71%	97.76%	97.69%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 11: Child Find****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
4,429	4,350	97.69%	100%	98.22%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]

79

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

Of the 4,429 initial evaluations under Part B conducted during FFY 2013, there were 79 that did not meet the 60-day timeline requirement. Of these 79, 32 were from the State's 48 public school districts, and 47 were from the State's developmental preschools. The range in days beyond the 60-day timeline was 1 to 102 days. Reasons for the delay: delays in evaluations; parental cancellation of meetings; breaks in school schedule; difficulty contacting parents; weather; student illness; incorrect calculation of 60-day timeline.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

These data are collected on the end-of-year child count file.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 11: Child Find****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find*

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
102	102		0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Regarding the 102 initial evaluations that were not completed within 60 days, the WDE requires specific corrective action from any LEA exhibiting a rate below 100% compliance with the 60-day requirement. First, the Department contacts each LEA with the student identification numbers of students whose initial evaluations were reportedly completed after sixty days from the LEA's receipt of consent. In each instance the LEA is required to provide an explanation for the delay. The only acceptable reasons are those found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1). After removing those with acceptable reasons, the WDE issues a letter containing findings for each of the students in whose case initial evaluations took longer than sixty days. LEAs are required to provide evidence that the student's evaluation was completed, although late, unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Then in order to ensure systemic correction for all students, the WDE reviews a sample of initial evaluations conducted during the current fiscal year to evidence 100% compliance for students other than those whose initial evaluations were completed late during the previous fiscal year. In this way the Department ensures that its identification and correction processes meet the requirements of the OSEP 09-02 Memo.

In the Department's analysis of LEA reasons for delays in completing initial evaluations within sixty days, the WDE determined that a small number of LEAs require additional support and oversight in this area. Some of the ways the WDE addressed this during FFY 2012 include the following:

- Depending upon the content of their CAP/compliance agreement, districts were provided with specially designed, on-site TA from WDE staff.
- Staffing levels are reviewed through various fiscal reports to identify potential personnel shortages that may be affecting an LEA's ability to complete initial evaluations in a timely manner.
- Districts found out of compliance on self assessment are provided TA if needed.

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance*

All noncompliance for the FFY2012 (the 102 evaluations) were timely corrected within the one-year timeframe. Each district with noncompliance in FFY2012 was (1) timely corrected within the one-year timeframe of notification and (2) is currently implementing the regulatory requirements of this indicator based on a review of updated data consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	68.29%	90.50%	89.80%	91.40%	95.00%	98.00%	94.40%	95.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	424
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	4
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	398
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	22
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	398	398	95.70%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	0
--	---

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

- State monitoring  
 State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

These data are collected on the end-of-year child count file.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18		0

#### FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In conducting its verification process, the WDE determined that the LEA (BHD) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement—in this case 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b). This was achieved by reviewing new documentation on a sample of student records not previously reviewed from the LEAs online special education database showing that IEPs were developed and implemented by the child's third birthday (for those referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B).

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance*

As reported in the FFY 2012 APR under Indicator 12, the WDE made 18 findings of noncompliance in this area during FFY 2012. In conducting its verification process, the WDE determined that the LEA (BHD) had corrected the child-specific noncompliance by developing and implementing an IEP for each child referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B, although late. This was achieved by reviewing additional documentation and explanation from the LEA regarding each instance in which the development and implementation of the IEP was not completed by the child's third birthday.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Historical Data and Targets

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					54.58% 56.40%	80.39%	82.06%	96.38%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### Explanation of Changes

The 2009 number is 256/469 which is 54.58%.

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Although the State's FFY 2013 data represent slippage from the FFY 2012 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2013 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition****FFY 2013 Data**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
398	418	96.38%	100%	95.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of Slippage**

The difference between the FFY2012 and FFY2013 Indicator 13 data is not statistically significant. The FFY 2013 rate is above 95%, and has been for the past two years. There were several new district Special Education directors in 2013-14, and there may have been some loss of institutional knowledge in districts regarding the requirements for postsecondary transition planning. The WDE will continue to provide technical assistance to those districts that are not achieving 100% compliance on this indicator to ensure that the state rate continues to move closer to 100%. The WDE will also provide all districts access to enhanced Indicator 13 guidance in advance of the Indicator 13 file review.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

To collect data for this indicator, the WDE selects a stratified, representative sample of ten student files from each district in the state. Districts with fewer than ten students of transition age are required to submit all IEPs of transition-aged students. Trained WDE staff members then review each of the files using the NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist Form A. Any file that meets all of the applicable checklist criteria is judged to meet the indicator.

- Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Although the State's FFY 2013 data represent slippage from the FFY 2012 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2013 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Although the State's FFY 2013 data represent slippage from the FFY 2012 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2013 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition****Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	15		0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

In conducting its verification process, the WDE determined that each LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements—in this case 34 C.F.R §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). This was achieved by requesting IEP files and meeting notices for a sample of students whose records were not reviewed during the initial transition review of December 2013. The WDE's review of these students' documentation during the spring of 2014 demonstrated that the LEAs in question were following compliant IEP transition practices.

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance*

As reported in the State's FFY 2012 APR under Indicator 13, the WDE made 15 findings of noncompliance in this area during that fiscal year. In conducting its verification process, the WDE determined that each LEA had corrected the child-specific noncompliance by reconvening the IEP team(s) or amending the program(s) to correct the deficiencies identified in the WDE's response letters of early 2014. The LEAs in question were required to submit Prior Written Notice forms and revised IEPs detailing the corrections made on each student's behalf.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Although the State's FFY 2013 data represent slippage from the FFY 2012 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2013 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2013 2009	Target ≥						40.00%	40.30%	41.00% 0.00%
		Data					40.00%	50.57% 50.60%	35.09% 35.10%	31.56% 0.00%
B	2013 2009	Target ≥						61.50%	61.80%	62.50%
		Data					61.54% 61.50%	68.18% 68.20%	56.73% 56.70%	63.46% 63.50%
C	2013 2009	Target ≥						72.30%	72.60%	73.30%
		Data					72.31% 72.30%	77.27% 77.30%	70.18% 70.20%	79.07% 79.10%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### Explanation of Changes

The data were rounded -- we put in the numbers to two decimals.

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	26.18%	26.43%	26.68%	26.93%	27.18%	27.43%
Target B ≥	58.12%	58.37%	58.62%	58.87%	59.12%	59.37%
Target C ≥	72.77%	73.27%	73.77%	74.27%	74.77%	75.75%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP), the WDE analyzed trend data for each indicator, which was collected during the course of the first SPP, from 2005 to 2012. The initial analysis of this data was conducted by the staff of the Special Programs Division. The trend data was then distributed to broad stakeholders. Presentations of this data were given during the Wyoming Administrators of Special Education Fall Conference, a State Independent Living Council meeting, and a Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. In addition, trend data, proposed targets, and a framework for feedback were distributed to local special education directors, educators, parents, and WAPSD members from across the state of Wyoming. During presentations, in discussions at meetings, and through the feedback framework, valuable input was provided regarding the setting of targets for the SPP. Revisions were made based on that feedback and final targets were reviewed with the WAPSD.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for 14C, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's end targets for Indicator 14A and 14B in FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targets for 14A and 14B to reflect improvement.

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

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

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	191
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	50
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	61
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	13
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	15

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	50	191	31.56%	26.18%	26.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	111	191	63.46%	58.12%	58.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	139	191	79.07%	72.77%	72.77%	Met Target	No Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for 14C, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's end targets for Indicator 14A and 14B in FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targets for 14A and 14B to reflect improvement.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

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

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

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for 14C, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's end targets for Indicator 14A and 14B in FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targets for 14A and 14B to reflect improvement.

**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥			100%				100%	
Data	100%	100%	0%		0%		50.00%	50.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

WDE did not gather stakeholder input because we did not establish baseline or targets as the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	50.00%		0%	Incomplete Data	Slippage

\*FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**
**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2013. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**Indicator 16: Mediation****Historical Data and Targets***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision***Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Historical Data***Baseline Data: 2005*

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		100%	100%			100%	100%	
Data	100%	100%	100%		66.67%		16.67%	85.71%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

WDE did not gather stakeholder input because we did not establish baseline or targets as the number of mediations is less than 10.

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Indicator 16: Mediation****FFY 2013 Data***Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision***Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	5	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data	Status	Slippage
1	2	5	85.71%		60.00%	Incomplete Data	Slippage

\* FFY 2012 Data and FFY 2013 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Required Actions from FFY 2012

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision*

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

#### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

#### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

#### OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement****Plan****Baseline and Targets***Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Baseline Data**

FFY	2013
Data	4.40%

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	4.40%	4.80%	5.20%	6.00%	8.40%

**Description of Measure**

Description of Measure:

The impact of State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) activities will be measured by an increase in *the percentage of third-grade students with disabilities who spend 21 to 60 percent of their school day outside the general education environment who score proficient or advanced on the statewide reading assessment*.

Percentage of students scoring Proficient/Advanced on the statewide reading assessment				
FFY Year	Target	# Students	# Students Scoring Proficient	
2013-14	4.40%	295	13	Actual
2014-15	4.40%	295	13	Proposed
2015-16	4.80%	295	14	Proposed
2016-17	5.20%	295	15	Proposed
2017-18	6.00%	295	18	Proposed
2018-19	8.40%	295	25	Proposed

The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) will also monitor changes in the number of students scoring Below Basic on the statewide reading assessment.

Percentage of Students scoring Below Basic on the statewide reading assessment				
FFY Year	Target	#Students	# Students Scoring Below Basic	
2013-14	79.32%	295	234	Actual
2014-15	79.32%	295	234	Proposed

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2015-16	75.00%	295	221	Proposed
2016-17	72.00%	295	212	Proposed
2017-18	70.00%	295	207	Proposed
2018-19	60.00%	295	177	Proposed

An increase of 4% in the number of students who score proficient/advanced on the statewide reading assessment, over a period of five years will double the baseline percentage. The WDE believes this target is not only ambitious, but also statistically significant and achievable.

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the description of stakeholder input provided below, details of stakeholder involvement in the SSIP Phase I process are embedded within the Data Analysis, Infrastructure Analysis, and Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies sections of this plan.

In order to gather stakeholder input for the SSIP Phase I, the WDE utilized a variety of sources and methods, including: conducting a needs assessment related to technical assistance and professional development for students with disabilities, an LEA special education director survey, a WDE Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis, Indicators 8 and 14 information, and feedback from the Wyoming Advisory Panel on Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), other WDE divisions, school and preschool administrators, teachers, service providers, and parents.

After completing the broad data analysis, the WDE assembled a small stakeholder group to conduct an in-depth data analysis and provide information about potential infrastructure needs. This stakeholder group was comprised of special education directors, special education teachers, related service providers, preschool administrators and teachers, a representative from the Wyoming Department of Health Behavioral Health Division (BHD), the Wyoming Children's Law Center, and the Parent Information Center (PIC). Results of the in-depth data analysis, including two potential broad areas of focus for the SSIP, were shared with members of the WAPSD panel and special education directors in order to obtain additional input.

Based on the data analyses, infrastructure analysis, and stakeholder input the SIMR was defined. To gather stakeholder views about potential improvement strategies, a survey was developed and distributed statewide to school administrators, special education directors and teachers, preschool administrators and teachers, related service providers, and general education teachers asking them to identify the strengths, barriers and challenges associated with improving the reading performance of preschool and early elementary-aged students. The WDE also solicited ideas on how to best improve the reading performance of students with disabilities.

At four regional and district-level data analysis events, attended by data teams from 45 of the 48 school districts, the WDE provided each district with district-level data regarding the performance of students in the early elementary grades who spend between 21 and 60% of their school day outside the general education environment. District representatives analyzed those data and compared them to statewide data and the data of similarly sized districts. Participants provided the WDE with information on the strengths, barriers, and challenges associated with district-level reading improvement efforts and ideas for potential improvement activities.

After reviewing the results of the data analyses, infrastructure analysis, and collective stakeholder input, three proposed strategies were developed and disseminated to the WAPSD panel, preschool regional administrators, other WDE divisions, and the WDE Division of Individual Learning employees for feedback and final approval. Members of the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) executive committee assisted the WDE in developing the language of the SSIP Theory of Action, which reflects a true collaboration between the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) and its stakeholders.

**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement****Plan****Data Analysis**

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

**Results indicator:** The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

**Data Analysis System and Process**

The WDE's general supervision system begins and ends with data. The Division of Individual Learning utilizes a robust, student-level data system. Each student is assigned a Wyoming Integrated Statewide Record Identifier (WISER ID), a unique identification number that allows the WDE to track a wide variety of student-level data, including: state assessment results, attendance, discipline, provision of assistive technology and Extended School Year (ESY), free and reduced lunch, homelessness, special education and related service provision, and more. The analysis of these data, along with stakeholder input, inform the following general supervision activities:

- assessing the effectiveness of state initiatives and their impact on improving student outcomes
- identifying areas of poor performance upon which to focus during the upcoming school year(s)
- selecting and prioritizing monitoring activities
- identifying topics and audiences for professional development and technical assistance
- evaluating the effectiveness of State Performance Plan (SPP) activities, and developing ideas for new activities
- identifying areas of concern which might necessitate guidance documents
- planning of focused fiscal oversight
- determining staffing needs

Since 2008 the WDE Division of Individual Learning has conducted an annual data drilldown, utilizing statewide previous school year data related to student performance, identification rates, the provision of special education and related services, assistive technology, ESY, student discipline, and more. Data are disaggregated by a variety of variables including: disability category, special education environment, performance on statewide assessments, race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, English language learners (ELL), age, grade, and gender. Participation in the data drilldown is required of all Division of Individual Learning staff members. External consultants and representatives from other WDE divisions are also invited and encouraged to attend the drilldown.

During this multi-day facilitated data analysis activity, participants carefully review the most recent data available concerning the performance of students with disabilities across each of the SPP indicators and additional data sources, in addition to compliance data. WDE team members collectively identify areas of concern which might potentially signify problems with the provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), child find, post-secondary transition, disproportionality, and other areas of noncompliance. There are several ways in which areas of concern might be identified through the drilldown process, including, but not limited to, the following:

- significantly low proficiency rates for students in certain subgroups or environments
- declines in proficiency rates for students in certain subgroups or environments over a period of years
- gaps between the proficiency rates of students with disabilities and the proficiency rates of their non-disabled peers
- significantly higher or lower state rates of identification in certain disability categories, as compared to national identification rates or those of similarly situated states
- consistent or dramatic decreases in rates of compliance on procedural indicators

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

As data are reviewed for each indicator, subgroups with significantly high or low performance are listed under the headings, "Areas of Strength" or "Areas of Concern." After analyzing the data across each of the indicators, those lists are reviewed to identify variables which were noted repeatedly across multiple indicators.

In November 2014 the Division of Individual Learning reviewed data from the following sources:

Data Source	Purpose
2013-14 student level ACT/PLAN/EXPLORE ("ACT Suite")	To generate performance level rates for students with disabilities at the secondary level and to compare the performance of students with disabilities to the performance of students without disabilities. The elements from the ACT Suite included performance scores on each of the subtests and the composite scores.
2013-14 student level Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS)	To generate performance level rates for students with disabilities at grades 3-8 and to compare the performance of students with disabilities to the performance of nondisabled students.
2013-14 student level information from the fall WDE 684 special education data collection	To analyze and report out on the characteristics of students with disabilities and to examine the enrollment patterns of students with disabilities once they leave special education and compare the characteristics of students with disabilities to the characteristics of non-disabled students.
2013-14 student level information from the June WDE 684 special education data collection	To analyze and report out on the characteristics of students with disabilities and to report out on the exiting status of students with disabilities.
2013-14 student level discipline information from the WDE 636	To generate discipline, suspension, and expulsion rates for students with disabilities and assess how they compare to rates for non-disabled students.
2013-14 student level graduation and drop-out information	To analyze and report out on graduation and drop-out rates and to provide districts with information on their graduation and drop-out cohorts.
2013-14 student level Fall and Spring MAP information	To generate performance level rates for students with disabilities at grades K-10 and to compare the performance of students with disabilities to the performance of non-disabled students.
2013-14 student level PAWS growth information	To generate growth rates for students with disabilities at grades 3-8 and 11 and compare the performance of students with disabilities to the performance of non-disabled students
Parent survey results	To assess levels of parent satisfaction related to the delivery of special education services to themselves and their children
Post-school outcomes interviews results	To assess the extent to which graduating students with disabilities are either employed, pursuing higher education or training, or both
Professional Development Needs Assessment	To assess professional development and technical assistance needs of districts. Administered to principals and special education directors January 2014
Special Education Director survey results	To obtain input on district needs related to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Administered to special education directors August 2014
WAPSD Panel questionnaire	To obtain feedback from members of the Wyoming Advisory Panel on Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) related to improving outcomes for students with disabilities

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2013-14 child level Child Outcomes Summary exit data	To generate performance level rates for preschool students with disabilities at the time they exited the preschool program.
2013-14 Part C to Part B transition data	To analyze the effectiveness of transition processes for children transitioning from an IFSP to an IEP.

The analysis of these data along with stakeholder input informs the WDE's plan to address statewide, regional- and district-level needs through the delivery of monitoring activities, professional development, technical assistance, guidance documents, and other state initiatives.

### Broad Data Analysis

The following data issues were noted by the WDE team in November 2014:

- New test/cut scores were used for the statewide assessment in 2013-14. This does not allow for direct comparison with previous years.
- There is concern about the low response rate (30%) on Indicator 14 (post-secondary outcomes). This rate is lower than the 40% response rate in 2013. The WDE plans to address this concern by adopting new methods of contacting former students.
- Due to Wyoming's low population, small n sizes sometimes make it difficult to generalize conclusions.

The following areas were noted as areas of improvement for students with disabilities:

Increased percentage of students in the general education environment

- Increased percentage of students receiving assistive technology
- Increased percentage of students receiving ESY
- Increased rate of parent involvement
- Increased percentage of exited students who are employed or enrolled in post-secondary education
- Increased percentage of students receiving timely initial evaluations
- Increased percentage of students with compliant transition IEPs by age 16
- Decreased percentage of students dropping out

The following areas were noted as areas of concern for students with disabilities:

- Decreased graduation rate
- Decreased percentage of districts meeting Annual Yearly Progress (AYP)
- Decreased participation rates on high school PAWS assessments
- Decreased percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on statewide assessments.

The following table reflects the analysis of data applied across the SPP indicators. Proficiency scores reflect percentages of students with disabilities who scored proficient or advanced on the 2014 Proficiency Assessment of Wyoming Students (PAWS).

Area of Focus	Areas of Strength	Areas of Concern
<b>Indicator 1</b> Graduation Rates	HI 90%; VI 80%; BI 75%;  72% SWD non-free & reduced lunch	<u>Overall Graduation:</u>  Students with disabilities (SWD) 59% vs. 81% students without disabilities  SS 9%; SF 22%; SC 19%; ED 46%;

		<p><u>Ethnicity:</u></p> <p>White 63% vs. Native 41%</p> <p><u>Environment:</u></p> <p>Regular classroom 73% vs. RR 53%</p> <p><u>Environment RE vs. RR:</u></p> <p>ED 61% vs. 38%</p> <p>HL 73% vs. 43%</p> <p>LD 74% vs. 56%</p>
<b>Indicator 2</b>  Dropout Rates	HI 0%; VI 0%; MU 9.1%	<p>Overall SWD 28% (snap shot)</p> <p>ELL 53%; ED 51%; Native American 41%</p> <p>FRL 34% dropped out vs. 18% dropped out non-FRL</p> <p><u>Rates of note:</u></p> <p>Students with ED in regular classroom: 36%</p> <p>Students with ED in resource room: 62%</p> <p>Students with ED in separate classroom: 100%</p> <p>Students with ED in separate facilities: 33%</p> <p>Students with ED in court-placed settings: 60%</p>

<b>Area of Focus</b>	<b>Areas of Strength</b>	<b>Areas of Concern</b>
<b>Indicator 3</b>  Statewide Assessment		<p>Despite changes in the test and CCSS, the gap between performance of SWD and non-disabled students remains similar to previous years.</p> <p>All areas of concern in Graduation Rates also are present in performance, especially significant in students with LD.</p> <p><u>Overall state reading proficiency rates</u></p> <p>Students in regular classroom, reading: 29% vs.</p>

		<p>Students in RR 6%</p> <p>Ethnicity: White = 24% vs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American = 15%</li> <li>• Hispanic = 13%</li> <li>• Native American = 7%</li> </ul> <p>-</p> <p><u>Environment by disability:</u></p> <p>SL students in RE: 63% proficient. SL students in RR: 13% proficient.</p> <p>HL students in RE: 48% proficient. HL students in RR: 24% proficient.</p> <p>LD students in RE: 38% proficient. LD students in RR: 14% proficient.</p> <p>Homeless = 14% proficient vs. 22%; math 8% vs. 19%</p> <p>If ED, HL, LD, or FRL and RR = 5%</p>
<b>Indicator 4</b>  Suspension/Expulsion	There is no significant discrepancy in indicators 4B & 4C. Further, only 97 SWD were suspended for more than 10 days in the State of Wyoming in 2012-13.	<p>Overall state rate = 4.6% of SWDs were suspended for ≥3 days</p> <p>Homeless 5.1%</p> <p><u>Ethnicity</u></p> <p>African American: 9%</p> <p><u>Environment</u></p> <p>Students in separate facilities: 13%</p> <p>Students in court-placed settings: 15%</p> <p>Students in separate school settings: 11%</p> <p><u>Primary Disability</u></p> <p>Emotional Disability (ED): 16%</p> <p>Other Health Impairment (HL): 9%</p>
<b>Indicator 5</b>	Overall 5A rate has increased from 56% (in	24% of white students placed in RR vs. 29% Hispanic

Least Restrictive Environment	2005-06) to 65% (2013-14).	13% of grade 1 students in RR vs. 33% of grade 10  9% SL vs. 34% students with LD  24% ED    29%HL
<b>Area of Focus</b>	<b>Areas of Strength</b>	<b>Areas of Concern</b>
<b>Indicator 6</b>  Pre-school LRE	6A and 6B rates have slightly improved over time.	6A and 6B rates vary significantly by preschool region.
<b>Indicator 7</b>  Pre-school skills	The percentage of students showing growth has significantly increased over time on all three outcome areas.	The percentage of students exiting at age level has stayed the same over time on all three outcome areas.
<b>Indicator 8</b>  Parent Involvement	The parent involvement rate has increased from 53% in 2005-06 to 75% in 2013-14.	Parents of preschool students are more positive than parents of K-12.
<b>Indicator 9</b>  Disproportionate Identification	We have not had any inappropriate identification issues.	N/A
<b>Indicator 10</b>  Disproportionate Racial/Ethnic Representation	We have not had any inappropriate identification issues.	One district flagged for African American ED, but cleared upon review of evaluation and eligibility procedures
<b>Indicator 11</b>  Child Find 60 days	Indicator 11 rate has increased from 75% in 2005-06 to 98% in 2013-14.	N/A
<b>Indicator 12</b>  Part C to Part B transition	The indicator 12 rate has increased from 68% in 2005-06 to 100% in 2013-14.	N/A
<b>Indicator 13</b>  Post-secondary	The indicator 13 rate has increased from 51% in 2005-06 to 95% in 2013-14.	N/A

Transition Planning		
<b>Indicator 14</b> Post-secondary Outcomes	14C rate has held consistently.	<p>78% of exited students who had been in the regular environment were employed or enrolled in post-secondary education vs. 67% of exited students who had been placed in RR.</p> <p>81% of exited students who graduated with a regular diploma were employed or enrolled in post-secondary education vs. 51% of exited students who dropped out.</p> <p>79% of exited students with a learning disability were employed or enrolled in post-secondary education vs. 54% of exited students with an emotional disability.</p>

Area of Focus	Areas of Strength	Areas of Concern
Note: Indicators 15-19 are not applicable for the purpose of this data analysis.		
<b>Indicator 20</b> Timeliness/Accuracy	We have maintained high rates of timeliness and accuracy.	N/A
Percentage of students receiving assistive technology	AT rates have increased from 2.5% in 2006-07 to 16.9% in 2013-14.	<p>8% of students in K-2 receive AT</p> <p>14% of students in 3-5 receive AT</p> <p>LD rate 18%</p> <p>ED rate 13%</p> <p>RE rate is 13%, RR rate is 21%</p>
Percentage of students receiving ESY	The ESY rate has increased from 6.6% in 2005-06 to 27.8% in 2013-14.	<p>RE rate for ESY is 18%</p> <p>RR rate for ESY is 41%</p>

		LD rate is 26%
		HL rate is 29%
		ED rate is 33%

Upon conclusion of the broad data analysis the WDE team agreed that the following performance areas were the most concerning:

- Snapshot Graduation rate (a one-year analysis of graduation rates) of ED students: **45.6%** of ED students graduated, as compared to 60.7% of SWD and 78.89% non-disabled students.
- Since 2009-10 fewer students with disabilities, on average, have scored proficient on the PAWS reading assessment (**33.8%**) than on the PAWS math assessment (40.8%)
- Reading performance of SWD (n=6807): **21.5%** proficient, as compared to non-disabled students (n=40,494) who were 62.2% proficient
- Reading performance of HL students (n=1308): **17.9%** proficient
- Reading performance of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch (n=3320): **17.1%** proficient
- Reading performance of LD students (n=3050): **10.9%** proficient
- Reading performance of students coded RR, who spend between 21 and 60% of their school day outside the general education environment (n=1971): - **5.7%** proficient
- Reading performance decreases as grade level increases for SWD, as noted below:

2014 PAWS and ACT reading performance of students with disabilities grades 3-11						
Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
30.3%	26.8%	23.2%	17.6%	17.2%	16.4%	8.5%

Analysis of Wyoming preschool data yielded the following:

- Child Outcome Summary (COS) scores taken when students exit preschool programs correlate strongly with fall Kindergarten Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) scores.
- Identification rates for students with speech language disabilities appear to be higher than average.
- The prevalence of speech language eligibility makes it difficult to disaggregate data and target the needs of students with specific programming requirements.

### In-Depth Data Analysis and Stakeholder input

The WDE assembled a group of 16 stakeholders on November 18 and 19, 2014 to review the results of the broad data analysis and conduct an in-depth analysis. This stakeholder group was comprised of Local Education Agency (LEA) special education directors, special education teachers, parent advocacy group representatives, preschool teachers and administrators, a representative of the Wyoming Children and Family Law Center, and others.

Stakeholders reviewed the results of a special education director survey and a professional development/technical assistance needs assessment. They analyzed data from the SSIP 2014 reading rr-ed-hl-lb data spreadsheet (see attachment 1) which outlines the reading performance of non-disabled students, students with disabilities, ED, LD, and HL students, students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, and students coded RR, who spend between 21 and 60% of their school day outside the general education environment.

A variety of questions were raised by the stakeholder group:

- Aside from proficiency rates, is there any movement of students who are below basic to basic?
- What would the attendance records look like for those subgroups who demonstrate the lowest rates of proficiency?
- What are the areas and rates of related services for students whose environment is coded RR?
- What percentage of students whose environment is coded RR receive no related services?
- Which states do well with ED students?

The group noted the following areas of concern related to their data analysis:

- Reading performance of students in the resource room, particularly ED, HL, and students who qualify for free and reduced lunch
- Instructional capacity of staff in preschools and elementary schools to meet the need of some students with disabilities
- Alignment of curriculum to state content and performance standards in the resource room
- Quality of instruction and practices in elementary schools vs. middle schools
- Instructional quality and practices in high schools

Ultimately, the group narrowed their concerns to two major areas:

1. reading performance of students who spend between 21 and 60% of their school day outside the general education environment
2. reading performance of high school students with disabilities

Stakeholders divided into two groups and completed a root cause analysis in an attempt to identify the cause(s) of low performance in each area.

Attachment 2 is a graphic representation of the root cause analysis process conducted by both groups:

When asked to identify possible root causes of low reading performance for high school students with disabilities and students in the resource room, both groups identified concerns about the quality of specially designed instruction, inconsistent use of accommodations in general education settings, and ineffective use of assistive technology. Specifically, for students who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment, stakeholders identified potential root causes as:

- Teacher preparation programs that do not include an evidence-based, focused approach to teaching reading to students with disabilities.
- Students with disabilities in primary grades who lack foundational reading skills
- Students with disabilities who do not have access to the general curriculum.

There was agreement among WDE staff and stakeholders that low reading performance is the major concern, particularly for students spend 21 to 60 percent of the school day outside the general education environment, however, the stakeholder groups were split as to whether the focus should be on the early grades or the high school level.

A survey was conducted of members of the Wyoming Advisory Panel on Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), special education

directors, and preschool administrators and teachers to share results of the stakeholder group work and obtain broader stakeholder input. Opinions were closely divided, but a majority of stakeholders believed that WDE reading initiatives will have a stronger longitudinal impact if they are directed at the early childhood and primary elementary grades. The need to focus the state's efforts at the preschool level and grades K-3 is clearly supported by preschool data findings, the low reading performance of third-grade students with disabilities, and MAP reading scores.

In order to better understand the root causes of low reading performance of students with disabilities in preschool and grades K-3, particularly those who spend between 20 and 61% of their school day in the general education environment, the WDE examined MAP scores of students in grades 1-3 and Child Outcome Summary (COS) scores of preschool students. There is a strong correlation between K-3 MAP reading scores and subsequent third-grade PAWS reading scores. For example, the correlation between the second-grade spring 2013 MAP reading RIT score and third-grade 2014 PAWS reading scale score is .75.

Performance of K-3 students on the MAP reading test, disaggregated by educational environment, shows the same pattern of results as the performance of third-grade students on the PAWS reading test. Sixty-two percent of K-3 students who spend 80% or more of their school day in the general education environment scored proficient on the spring 2014 MAP reading test, as compared to 20% of K-3 students who are only in the general education environment between 40 and 79% of the school day.

The WDE found a small correlation between the exit scores for the *Acquiring Knowledge and Skills* COS subtest and the subsequent kindergarten fall MAP reading and math scores. The correlation between the preschool spring 2013 COS *Knowledge and Skills* score and the kindergarten fall 2013 PAWS reading scale score is .33. Because the MAP and PAWS scores are correlated, and because the same patterns are present in the two tests relative to educational environment, the WDE will use COS and MAP scores, not only as predictors of PAWS performance but also to identify students, particularly those who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment, who potentially need reading interventions.

In January 2015, the WDE provided all Wyoming LEAs reports of their third-grade MAP reading and third-grade PAWS reading results, disaggregated by educational environment and various demographic variables so they could begin to identify areas of strength and target areas of improvement for students outside the general education environment. LEAs were asked to review these reports and begin developing action plans.

The WDE will continue to explore ways in which COS data can be used along with MAP and PAWS data to impact the literacy skills of students in preschools and grades K-3. Given that the COS is administered only at entry to and exit from preschool, MAP is administered 2-3 times per school year, and PAWS is administered annually, there remains a need to explore ways in which the progress of preschool students might be used to identify areas of improvement in preschool reading instruction.

**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement****Plan****Analysis of State Infrastructure**

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

**Results indicator:** The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

**Infrastructure Analysis**

Analysis of the Wyoming education infrastructure revealed some significant strengths as well as some noteworthy areas of weakness. Thanks, in part, to rich mineral revenues, the Wyoming education system is fiscally strong, providing 100 percent reimbursement to school districts for special education costs. The Division of Individual Learning utilizes one of the most robust data systems for students with disabilities of any state in the nation. Wyoming's low student population of 91,000 students affords the opportunity to intervene and see results relatively quickly, compared to larger states, like California, where there are more than sixty-eight times that number of students in public schools.

In addition to the many advantages Wyoming enjoys, it also has its share of disadvantages. The state covers a geographic area of more than 97,000 square miles, but is the least populous state in the union, with just over 62,000 people estimated in 2013. Many Wyoming communities are isolated and rural which presents unique challenges in terms of collaboration and service delivery.

The WDE began its SSIP infrastructure analysis by conducting a professional development needs assessment of special education directors and principals across the state and a survey specific to results driven accountability (RDA) of all LEA special education directors. After completing the broad data analysis, the WDE assembled a group of stakeholders for an in-depth data analysis. This stakeholder group also provided input on infrastructure elements. Feedback was then solicited from the WAPSD panel related to potential areas of focus.

WDE employees participated in a facilitated SWOT analysis, examining the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats inherent in Wyoming's current education system. Small groups completed initial analyses of the following areas: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring, utilizing an infrastructure analysis template provided by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

The WDE utilized an SEA capacity rubric, a tool deigned to assess an SEA's capacity to successfully implement a statewide initiative. Recognizing that Wyoming is in the early stages of SSIP planning, there were many areas of the rubric that yielded low capacity scores; however, the rubric provided a baseline score that will be used to assess state capacity growth in subsequent stages of the SSIP. The longitudinal data system was analyzed using the ten essential elements identified by the Data Quality Campaign, a tool recommended by the OSEP Regional Resource Centers (RRCs).

A survey was developed and sent to administrators, special education directors, preschool administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, related service providers, preschool teachers and others, asking about professional development and technical assistance needs related to reading interventions for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3, with an emphasis on those students who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment. That survey also solicited input on ideas for strategies that might best address the needs of students in those groups. Finally an RRC Infrastructure Analysis tool was applied to assess implementation capacity in each of the areas noted above (governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring).

Results of all these infrastructure analysis mechanisms and activities were compiled individually in order to begin to identify common themes. Information from various sources was organized under each of the infrastructure areas (governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring). Multiple documents, spreadsheets, and tables were created in order to synthesize information from a variety of sources for the purpose of

infrastructure analysis.

The end results of this process were long lists of strengths and potential infrastructure gaps in each of the following broad areas:

- Leadership/Consistent Message
- Coordination of professional development and technical assistance
- Leveraging technical assistance to support other systems/projects
- Use of data and evaluation mechanisms
- Support to preschool programs

### **Governance**

Between 2011 and 2014 the WDE experienced multiple changes in policy and leadership. Three different individuals occupied the state superintendent/WDE director position during that period. There was a 50 percent employee turnover rate, resulting in a significant loss of institutional knowledge. Every division within the WDE experienced high rates of turnover. Since 2011 the Division of Individual Learning has had five different state directors, and two-thirds of the section supervisors have resigned, along with numerous consultant-level and administrative support-level personnel. Delivering a consistent message and rebuilding the capacity and credibility of the WDE Division of Individual Learning to effectively meet its statutory obligations and assist schools and LEAs in improving outcomes for students with disabilities will be a critical element of the SSIP.

While there are currently no established processes, guidelines, or criteria for selecting stakeholders outside the WDE to be included in improvement initiatives, attempts were made to select a broad group that represented the interests of all parties who would be impacted by the SSIP. In 2014, a survey of special education directors was conducted and each director was offered the opportunity to collaborate on the RDA initiative and the SSIP. Eight of the 48 directors elected to participate, along with school administrators, teachers, parents, preschool teachers and administrators, and others.

The Part B oversight structure of special education services for 3-5 year olds in Wyoming involves two state agencies. The Behavioral Health Division (BHD), formerly known as the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), of the Wyoming Department of Health has direct oversight responsibility for preschools, and the WDE maintains responsibility for general supervision under the IDEA. In a March 3, 2011 verification letter, Melody Musgrove, Director of OSEP, expressed concern about the WDE's oversight of preschool programs. The following is an excerpt from that letter:

*...As you know, Wyoming has designated the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), within the Wyoming Department of Health, as responsible for ensuring that children with disabilities ages three through four, and five-year old children not enrolled in kindergarten, are provided special education and related services. However, the status of the DDD as the State agency responsible for preschool education programs does not alter or diminish the WDE's responsibility to exercise general supervision over the DDD and the preschool programs for children with disabilities operated by the DDD. Under 34 C.F.R. §300.149, the State educational agency (SEA) is responsible for ensuring the requirements of Part B are carried out and that each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the State, including each program administered by any other State or local agency, is under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational programs for children with disabilities in the SEA and meets the educational standards of the SEA (including the requirements of Part B). OSEP has serious concerns about WDE's exercise of its general supervisory responsibility over DDD with respect to the implementation of the State's special education preschool program. (pp. 1-2)*

The WDE responded to OSEP's concerns by developing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the BHD, which outlines the responsibilities of each agency. Both agencies now collaborate on general supervision efforts.

### **Fiscal**

The WDE utilizes state and federal special education funding to support its IDEA general supervision system. As with all components of the WDE's general supervision system, fiscal processes are data-driven. As a result of the annual statewide data analysis and review of infrastructure capacity, the WDE develops and disseminates Request for Proposals (RFPs) for coaches, contractors and external consultants in order to assist with implementation of improvement activities, ensure monitoring and compliance work, and increase staff knowledge and capacity in the areas of special education law and enforcement of IDEA regulations.

LEAs receive federal special education funding in addition to state funding through the Wyoming School Foundation Model. State funding provides full reimbursement to school districts for IEP-related costs, and preschools are funded at a per child rate of approximately \$8,000.00.

The WDE utilizes SPP indicator data as the foundation for managing IDEA funds allocated to each LEA. The indicator data for each LEA is entered into the Grants Management System (GMS). Districts utilize indicator data to review and analyze their performance and to create objectives and outline activities for future implementation. For any indicator that did not meet the state target, the district is required to create an objective and related activities designed to improve outcomes in that area as a condition of Part B funding. LEAs report expenditures by indicator. Throughout the course of the grant cycle, the WDE monitors expenditures and contacts LEAs, if necessary, to ensure that the proposed activities are being implemented. To ensure accountability for the use of IDEA funds, the WDE conducts fiscal monitoring through the Special Education Accountability Documentation (SEAD) fiscal desk audit. This process occurs on a three-year rotating cycle with 16 LEAs being reviewed each year.

The annual analysis of special education data related to student outcomes indicators in the SPP allows the WDE to develop improvement strategies that target data-based areas of concern. This process also allows the WDE to analyze the effectiveness of its activities and make changes if those activities do not result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities. The Division of Individual Learning collaborates with other WDE divisions as well as other state and private agencies to align efforts that will result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities. These collaborative efforts allow the WDE to maximize the effectiveness of its professional development and technical assistance services, thereby saving fiscal resources.

Wyoming uses state and federal special education dollars to fund improvement strategies. Because data analysis is the foundation for fiscal planning, adequate resources are available to implement improvement strategies. Coordinating the use of federal funds, state level special education funds and State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funds will allow the WDE to address its general supervision responsibilities and fund the improvement strategies developed under the SSIP.

### **Quality Standards**

The following standards guide curriculum and instruction, and ensure proper certification and qualifications of educators and service providers:

- Wyoming state statutes (core knowledge and skills)
- Wyoming Content and Performance Standards
- District standards
- PAWS, Wyoming's statewide assessment
- Wy-Alt, Wyoming's alternate assessment
- Professional Teaching Standards Board (PTSB) requirements for licensure and endorsements of teachers and other service providers
- Highly qualified teacher requirements
- Early Learning Foundations and Guidelines

The WDE works with AdvancEd to confirm that administrators, educators, service providers, and other key personnel meet established standards by evaluating misassignments as part of the AdvancEd accreditation process. A WDE representative evaluates the PTSB certifications of LEA administrators, educators, and other providers to ensure compliance with required standards.

The WDE has select mechanisms in place for evaluating a variety of activities. A standardized evaluation tool is used to assess participant levels of satisfaction and solicit suggestions for future trainings at WDE trainings and presentations. A different evaluation tool is used for the same purposes for the Wyoming Leadership Symposium. Evaluation activities for all federal grants are met, as required. Some evaluation mechanisms are specific to the goals and objectives of individual projects, however, for many activities, evaluation methods are still a work in progress. There are a variety of mechanisms in place for soliciting feedback from stakeholders. The 22-member WAPSD panel meets 8 times per year to advise the WDE about issues relating to students with disabilities. The State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) requires that a Needs Survey be distributed to district special education directors in order to identify professional development needs. Other surveys and needs assessments are conducted on an as-needed basis. Formal evaluations are also conducted as needed.

The WDE utilizes and analyzes data to assess the effectiveness of its general supervision system. A variety of formal and informal methods are used to evaluate activities and establish processes, guidelines, and criteria, however there is a need to formalize these processes in order to ensure a more coordinated, reliable, and transparent approach to general supervision and implementation efforts.

## **Professional Development**

The WDE defines professional development as "learning activities designed to increase professional skills or knowledge base." The WDE's system of providing professional development includes:

- Annual Leadership Symposium
- Various activities supported by the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)
- Professional development activities delivered or supported in response to district requests
- Outreach professional development delivered to administrators, teachers, and related services providers for deaf and hard of hearing and visually impaired students
- Employee attendance at local, regional or national conferences
- Areas of concern identified at the annual data drilldown
- Presentations at other statewide events (i.e. Homeless Education Workshop, Early Childhood conference, PIC conference, etc.)
- Mandatory participation of all Division of Individual Learning staff on CIFM monitoring visits
- Monthly one-hour Blackboard Collaborate sessions that cover a variety of topics

The Wyoming Leadership Symposium (WSL) is a week-long conference that is divided between a best practice institute and an education law seminar. The best practice institute features sessions that include co-teaching, universal design for learning, early childhood and post-secondary transition practices, and strategies for partnering with general education. The education law seminar features nationally recognized special education attorneys who offer presentations on a variety of topics and question and answer sessions. A majority of the topics and presenters are selected with input from educators, parents, and other stakeholders. Response to the Leadership Symposium has been favorable, with attendance of over 400 in 2014, and increasing every year.

The WDE is in Year 2 of a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) awarded by OSEP. The purpose of the SPDG is to assist the state in reforming and improving its professional development system relating to early intervention, educational and transition services designed to improve results for students with disabilities. This grant is intended to scale-up and strengthen technical assistance and professional development resources available to local educational agencies in order to increase their capacity to improve instructional practices and improve outcomes for students with disabilities ages 3 through 21.

The goals of the WDE SPDG are:

1. To increase the capacity of educational agencies to implement evidence-based practices that will result in improvement on the State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators.

Objectives: cross-training, statewide TA and local level TA.

2. To develop and disseminate information and resources in a variety of formats for parents and educational agencies that will result in increased awareness and knowledge.

Objective: Information dissemination (Project WIN). Project WIN is a web-based platform that LEAs can use to access current guidance, technical assistance and professional development.

## **FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

The current SPDG is supporting a Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) initiative statewide. This initiative targets all grades levels, including K-3. The WDE will leverage the MTSS project to align with the SSIP.

LEAs are experiencing improved outcomes in schools where MTSS is being implemented with rigor and fidelity. Research shows that school and LEA engagement, aligning resources, promoting increased collaboration, and serving students through a rigorous MTSS leads to:

- Improved reading and math assessment scores for all students
- A decrease in inappropriate referrals to special education
- A decrease in suspensions and expulsions
- Improved collaboration between general and special education personnel
- Corresponding cost benefits

### **Data**

Wyoming implements a robust, comprehensive data system that consolidates student-level information throughout the education system. The Wyoming Integrated Statewide Education (WISE) Data System connects several different software systems and/or databases within local school districts and the state. Currently, every child within the Wyoming school system is given a unique identification number known as a WISER ID (Wyoming Integrated Statewide Record Identifier). The value of the WISER ID includes:

- Single ID for all K-12 students and preschool students with IEPs
- Unique within the state
- Follows students as they transition to and from educational agencies within the state
- Used for all student-level state reporting
- Automatic connection with district Student Information System (SIS)
- Secure and confidential
- Separate from state statistical data
- Capability of linking data for an individual student across multiple data collections

Specifically for students with disabilities, the WDE collects student-level data via the following data collections:

- WDE-684 - a "snapshot" collection that occurs three times per year—fall, spring, and at the end of school year.
- WDE-636 - a report of severe disciplinary actions, and incidents of crime and violence that occur on school grounds or at school sponsored events occurring during the prior school year.
- Graduation and dropout rates
- Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS)
- ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE
- WDE-567 – a Title I Part D report of reading and math performance for students in Wyoming Institutional Schools
- 2014-15 WDE600 - WISE attendance and membership data file
- 2014-15 WDE 626 - Early literacy longitudinal data collection fall 2014, June 2015, and fall 2015
- WDE 686A – Student demographics for institutional schools
- 2014-15 WDE 567 –Institutional schools title 1 part d

For all collections, the required items are similar and include:

- WISER ID numbers
- Standard demographic variables (i.e.
  - Gender
  - Disability category
  - Special education environment
  - Statewide assessment performance
  - Race and ethnicity
  - Socioeconomic status
  - English language learners (ELL)
  - Age
  - Grade

- Service data

The WDE is also able to connect individual student scores on the statewide assessment and some district assessments to other data related to that student. This allows the department to track the performance of individual students and provides a standardized metric that allows comparisons among a host of variables including districts, schools, population groups, and disability types.

The Division of Individual Learning data system was analyzed by using the ten essential elements identified by the Data Quality Campaign. Of the ten essential components, Wyoming has the following seven in place:

- A unique statewide student identifier that connects student data across key databases across years
- Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information
- The ability to match individual students' test records from year to year
- Information on untested students and the reasons they were not tested.
- Student-level college readiness test scores,
- Student-level graduation and dropout data.
- A state data audit system that assesses data quality, validity, and reliability.

The Division of Individual Learning is currently capable of implementing the following two components:

- A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students by classroom and subject
- Collect student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned.

While the system is able to link data for students in preschools through grade 12, the capacity does not currently exist to link data to college records. The WDE has various edit checks in place, and the Division of Individual Learning utilizes the CIFM monitoring system and desk audit processes to conduct data accuracy checks; however, concerns remain about the accuracy and validity of some data. The WDE offers training to educational agencies in an effort to improve the accuracy of data reporting.

Below is the analysis of the WDE Division of Individual Learning Longitudinal Data System:

Element	Description	Yes	In Process	No
<b>Element 1</b>  <b>A unique statewide student identifier that connects student data across key databases across years</b> (a single non-duplicated number assigned to an individual student that remains with that student from kindergarten through high school).	<p>The unique identifier provides a way to link information about individual students across data systems to get a complete picture as students move through their education careers and across schools and school districts within the state.</p> <p><i>A statewide student identifier can help policymakers and educators know the following, among other things:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• achievement levels in previous grades that indicate that a student is on track to succeed in subsequent grades</li> <li>• attendance patterns, which may signal a need for intervention</li> <li>• students' academic progress as they move to different school districts, saving teachers valuable time as they wait on student records</li> </ul>	ü		Technical

## Assistance

The WDE defines technical assistance as “the provision of customized resources or supports to an individual or targeted group, based on the unique needs of that person or group.” Some of the ways in which the WDE provides technical assistance to LEAs and other stakeholders include the following:

- Providing individualized technical assistance to educational agencies to assist in meeting the needs of students with low incidence disabilities.
- IEP forms trainings for LEAs and other educational agencies
- Regional Data Share Out events
- Developing and implementing corrective action plans
- Developing and implementing compliance agreements
- Planned regional technical assistance presentations and related materials
- Guidance documents posted on the website
- Technical assistance online PowerPoint presentations
- Technical assistance provided in response to an LEA requests (i.e. Response to Intervention (RTI), Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI), etc.)
- Training and coaching to assist the BHD in implementing a performance based monitoring system
- Responses to telephone and email inquiries made by staff from preschools, LEAs, other educational agencies, and parents

Outreach services at the WDE are provided to low incidence populations of deaf and hard of hearing students and students with visual impairments. As the state does not have state schools for students with these disabilities, consultants provide consultative support to their service providers in LEAs and preschool programs. These services include targeted assistance and professional development designed to ensure FAPE in the LRE for these student populations.

There is a section of employees within the WDE designated to coordinate and provide technical assistance to LEAs and other educational agencies. Staff from other Division of Individual Learning sections assist in providing technical assistance, as necessary. The WDE contracts for professional consulting services in the areas of special education law and dispute resolution, data management, and general supervision. In addition, organizations such as Wyoming Assistive Technology Resources (WATR) and Wyoming Institute for Disabilities (WIND) assist individuals with disabilities, their families and service professionals through education, training, community services, and early intervention.

## Monitoring/Accountability

Consistent with the requirements established in 34 C.F.R. §§300.600 through 300.604, the WDE employs a Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring (CIFM) system that focuses on those elements of information and data that most directly relate to or influence student performance, educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. The CIFM system is a major component of the State's overall general supervision structure and includes four major components:

- Stable assessment
  - District self-assessment
  - Annual internal compliance review
- Risk-based assessment
- On-site focused monitoring
- On-site random and special monitoring

Many IDEA program requirements are closely related to student outcomes and results; other requirements, while still important, are not as closely related to outcomes. By implementing the four components listed above, the WDE monitors compliance with both types of requirements. District and state data from Wyoming's State Performance Plan (SPP) and other student-level data are the foundation of the CIFM system.

Typically, states employing focused monitoring systems choose focus indicators on an annual basis to guide the selection of districts for on-site monitoring. The WDE's CIFM system, however, uses a formula made up of key SPP indicators that

emphasize student outcomes and educational results. There is a section of employees primarily responsible for monitoring activities; however, staff members from all sections are required to participate on CIFM monitoring teams, to ensure a diverse range of expertise on monitoring teams and as a means of obtaining ongoing knowledge and skills related to IDEA regulations for students with disabilities.

## **SEA Capacity**

The WDE utilized the SEA Capacity Rubric (Harsh, S. (2010). *Gaining perspective on a complex task: A multidimensional approach to capacity building*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center) to measure the department's capacity to implement a statewide initiative. The rubric identified the following capacity types used to determine SEA capacity:

- Human capacity - number of staff allocated for implementation and intellectual proficiency (knowledge, expertise, and understanding) needed to implement an initiative
- Organizational capacity – interaction, collaboration, and communication among stakeholders
- Structural capacity - The elements of the organization that exists independent of the persons who work within the system such as policies, procedures, and practices
- Material capacity – fiscal resources, materials, and equipment that the organization uses to implement the initiative
- Political capacity - Enabling legislation and the support of executive leadership

Scores indicated higher current levels of capacity in the areas of material capacity and political capacity. Scores indicated greater opportunity for improvement in the areas of human capacity, organizational capacity, and structural capacity. These scores will serve as a baseline by which to measure the WDE's capacity throughout the implementation of the SSIP.

The WDE Division of Individual Learning currently employs 25 people at the director, supervisor, consultant, and administrative support levels.

While there appear to be sufficient fiscal resources to support the implementation, scaling up, and sustaining of practices, programs and models to improve results for students with disabilities, the Division of Individual Learning's limited human capacity available for implementation of initiatives will require extensive alignment and leveraging of resources.

Wyoming's SSIP infrastructure analysis revealed some important strengths as well as some significant areas of weakness. Strengths include adequate fiscal resources; a robust well-developed data system; a well-defined, data driven, performance based monitoring system; the Project WIN infrastructure; and some longstanding PD/TA activities that are valued by the education community (i.e. Leadership Symposium, regional Data Shareouts, IEP forms trainings, and outreach services for low incidence populations).

Potential infrastructure gaps include limited human capacity available to assist with implementation of the SSIP; a need for more clearly defined systems, processes, and criteria in some areas; a need for additional focus, coordination, and consistency in internal and external professional development and technical assistance activities; and a need for evaluation mechanisms and systems used to analyze quality, fidelity, and impact of improvement initiatives.

**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement****Plan****Measurable Results for Students with Disabilities***Monitoring Priority: General Supervision***Results indicator:** The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

*Statement*

Wyoming's State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is the increase in the percentage of third-grade students with disabilities who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment who score proficient or advanced on the statewide reading assessment. On the FFY13-14 statewide reading assessment (PAWS) only 4.4% of the students in the SIMR subgroup scored proficient or advanced. Wyoming's SSIP goal is to increase that percentage to 8.4% by 2018.

*Description*

The Wyoming SIMR aligns with the philosophy of the WDE Early Childhood Readiness Team (ECRT), the purpose of which is to provide leadership and support to schools, organizations, educators, families, and communities in implementing programs to assist children in becoming lifelong learners at an early age. The years before a child reaches kindergarten are among the most critical influences on learning. Kindergarten readiness and early literacy skills are essential to fostering a base for strong learning. Collaboration and communication between the WDE, the ERCT, and early childhood agencies will be crucial to achieving the SIMR. Providing strong early learning programs can engage parents, communities, and children in the first steps of the educational process. The WDE's expectation is that, through the implementation of SSIP efforts, which will align with Early Childhood domains and Wyoming Content and Performance Standards, the quality of pre-literacy instruction for students in preschools and reading instruction for students in grades K-3 will improve, thereby resulting in increased COS Academic Skills and Knowledge, MAP reading, and PAWS reading scores for students in the target population.

The Wyoming SIMR will impact indicator 3c by targeting and measuring the PAWS reading scores of third-grade students who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment, however, the WDE will also examine a variety of results from other assessments and data sources, to gain a better understanding of factors that appear to influence the low performance of the SIMR subgroup and the instructional implications for students who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment. SSIP activities will focus on students in preschools and grades K-3; however, the WDE recognizes that issues surrounding reading instruction in the general education environment and the development of strong Tier I reading systems will be part of the SSIP conversation as WDE moves forward with its stakeholders to improve reading outcomes for all Wyoming students with disabilities.

**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement****Plan****Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

**Results indicator:** The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

The 2014 WDE data analysis indicated that students with disabilities are not performing well in reading. 62.2% of non-disabled K-12 students scored proficient or advanced in reading on the 2014 PAWS test, but only 21.5% of K-12 students with disabilities were proficient or advanced. 67.8% of non-disabled third-grade students were proficient or advanced, but fewer than half (30.3%) of third-graders with disabilities were proficient or advanced. Moreover, only 4.4% of those third-graders who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment were proficient or advanced on the reading assessment.

Wyoming stakeholders identified the following potential root causes of low reading performance:

- Teacher preparation programs that do not include an evidence-based, focused approach to teaching reading to students with disabilities.
- Students with disabilities in primary grades who lack foundational reading skills.
- Students with disabilities who do not have access to the general curriculum.

The SSIP infrastructure analysis revealed some important strengths as well as some significant areas of weakness. Strengths include adequate fiscal resources, a robust well-developed data system, a well-defined, performance based monitoring system, the Project WIN website, and some longstanding PD/TA activities (i.e. Leadership Symposium, regional Data Shareouts, IEP forms trainings, and outreach services for low incidence populations that are to be valued by the education community).

Areas of weakness identified through the infrastructure analysis include limited human capacity available to assist with implementation of SSIP initiatives, a need for clearly defined systems, processes, and criteria, a need for focus, coordination, and consistency with some internal and external professional development and technical assistance activities, and a need for evaluation mechanisms and systems used to analyze quality, fidelity, and improvement measures.

After working with stakeholders to select the SIMR, an increase in the reading performance of third-grade students with disabilities who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment from 4.4% to 8.4%, the WDE solicited additional stakeholder input about possible improvement strategies. Information from multiple sources was considered before the WDE proposed the following three draft strategies:

1. • Consistent Message
2. • Professional Development and Technical Assistance
3. • Use of Data and Evaluation Tools

The proposed strategies and supporting information were presented to members of the WAPSD panel for their review and feedback. Members of other WDE divisions, all WDE Division of Individual Learning staff, and pre-school administrators were also provided with the opportunity to review the proposed strategies and provide input. A significant majority of those stakeholders felt that the proposed strategies would address the potential infrastructure gaps and lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR. Based on some specific stakeholder input, the proposed strategies underwent some minor revisions before being presented to the Wyoming Association of Special Education Directors, who submitted input used to craft the language for the SSIP Theory of Action.

The three strategies the WDE will use to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3 are: Aligned Resources, Meaningful Professional Development and Technical Assistance, and Effective Use of Data and Evaluation Tools

**Aligned Resources**

- The WDE will align human and fiscal resources, policies, guidance documents, projects, and services to support the SSIP goal of improving reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3.*

Aligning resources and establishing and sustaining a consistent message will make the WDE's vision, priorities, and activities clear to everyone, internally and externally. Being able to communicate with consistency the purpose and vision of the WDE will result in further clarity through repetition. Staying "on message" is even more important after experiencing a period of multiple leadership changes, and attempting to repair damage and restore credibility caused by historical inconsistency and mixed messages.

By aligning human and fiscal resources, policies, guidance documents, projects, and services to support reading initiatives designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3, rather than initiating and supporting a variety of random activities focused on a multiple different outcomes, the WDE will increase the probability that its efforts will result in a more substantial positive impact. The WDE will analyze current Division of Individual Learning staffing structure and align responsibilities to ensure adequate staff resources to perform the work of the general supervision system, including SSIP initiatives. By developing and implementing clearly defined procedures for established systems and processes, the WDE will ensure consistent delivery of all services required by statute, and be able to analyze ways in which existing activities might be refocused to support SSIP initiatives.

The WDE will align existing resources, including monitoring and fiscal systems, to support achievement of the SSIP. The utilization of a data-driven, performance based monitoring system to ensure the provision of FAPE for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3 will increase the probability that potential compliance-related barriers to reading improvement will be identified and addressed. A monitoring selection formula based on SSIP-related data will be created in order to focus on those preschools and LEAs whose data indicate are in greatest need of improvement in areas related to reading improvement for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3, particularly students in that subgroup who spend 20 to 61% of their school day outside the general education environment.

The WDE will also ensure strategic, sufficient allocation of resources to support activities related to the provision of FAPE and the use of data to monitor, guide, and improve student outcomes and the implementation of evidence-based, differentiated reading instruction for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3.

### **Meaningful Professional Development and Technical Assistance**

- The WDE will provide differentiated resources, including models and exemplars, and evidence-based information to parents, preschools, and LEAs.*
- The WDE will support the professional development of effective personnel at the state, LEA, elementary school and preschool levels to implement and sustain evidence-based, differentiated instructional systems designed to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3.*
- The WDE will leverage technical assistance resources to engage and support established systems within the WDE and across the state in improving reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3.*

Research shows that teaching quality and school leadership are the most important factors in raising student achievement. Student learning and achievement increase when educators engage in effective professional development focused on the skills they need to address students' diverse learning challenges. By implementing high-quality professional development and technical assistance activities at the state, LEA and preschool levels, focused on evidence-based, differentiated reading instruction, the WDE will increase the probability that students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3 will receive effective reading instruction that addresses their unique needs from competent, qualified teachers.

By providing differentiated resources, including models and exemplars, and evidence-based information to parents, preschools, and LEAs, the WDE will serve as an information broker by researching and vetting a myriad of material related to improving reading skills for students with disabilities to ensure that it is consistent with the criteria established for SSIP activities. Supporting teachers, parents, and LEAs by providing easy access to relevant resources and information is a strategy Wyoming stakeholders believe will be effective in achieving the goal of improving pre-literacy and early reading skills for students in preschools and grades K-3.

The WDE's support for the professional development of effective personnel at the state, LEA, elementary school, and preschool levels to implement and sustain evidence-based, differentiated instructional systems designed to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3 will be designed to build capacity at each level. For state personnel, professional development will include a variety of activities designed to improve knowledge and skills in the areas

of evidence-based differentiated reading instructional practices, data analysis, implementation of IDEA regulations, and systems development. Professional development activities offered at the LEA level will focus on developing instructional leaders with the skills, knowledge and expertise to implement, monitor, and guide effective systems designed to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3. School-level professional development activities will include topics such as evidence-based, differentiated reading instructional strategies and best practices, implementation of multi-tiered systems of support, effective progress monitoring, and the use of data to improve student outcomes.

The WDE will leverage technical assistance resources to engage and support established systems within the WDE and across the state in improving reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3. Leveraging resources to provide coordinated, collaborative professional development and technical assistance will increase the reach, efficacy, and impact of the WDE's efforts. Rather than "reinventing the wheel," WDE resources will be leveraged to focus, support, and augment other established systems within the WDE and across the state to improve reading performance for students in preschools and grades K-3. Examples of systems that could be engaged to achieve SSIP goals include:

- WDE Early Childhood Team
- WDE Title I program
- WDE Statewide System of Support (SSOS)
- WDE Digital Learning Team
- BHD Part B program
- University of Wyoming Research Literacy Center
- Wyoming Assistive Technology Resources (WATR)
- Wyoming Institute for Disabilities (WIND)
- Other state reading initiatives

The WDE will offer a collection of PD/TA and support resources to ensure that LEAs and regional child development centers have the capacity to implement and sustain effective, differentiated reading instructional systems.

Due to Wyoming's large geographic area and the WDE's limited human capacity, the delivery of professional development and technical assistance will be scaled up by utilizing and expanding web-based resources, such as the Project WIN website, by videotaping trainings and professional development activities and posting them on website, by utilizing web-based platforms and forums to provide increased access and opportunities for participation in professional development and technical assistance activities during times that are convenient to target audiences. The WDE will also continue to analyze data to identify key regions whose data indicate might have the greatest need for assistance in the area of reading improvement for students in preschools and grades K-3.

### **Effective Use of Data and Evaluation Tools**

- *The WDE will develop data analysis systems and processes to ensure the quality, fidelity, and efficacy of its internal and external activities.*
- *The WDE will develop and use evaluation tools, mechanisms and systems designed to assess quality, fidelity, and improvement of reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3.*

Research has confirmed that using data to inform instructional decisions leads to improved student performance, but if the data are only used as a means of ranking students, schools, and LEAs their most powerful benefits are missed. Formative assessments allow teachers to check for understanding in order to guide instruction. They are used during instruction rather than at the end of a unit or course of study. Likewise, the WDE will develop a data analysis system that allows for incremental data analysis in order to monitor and guide the implementation of the SSIP interventions. The use of data to evaluate formative progress is critical to the success or failure of a large-scale plan such as the SSIP. The WDE recognizes that sometimes 'you have to slow down in order to move quickly.' Investing in the development of a comprehensive data analysis system will increase the efficacy of reading improvement efforts at the state, LEA, and school levels.

If the WDE develops aligned data analysis systems and processes to evaluate the quality, fidelity, and efficacy of its internal and external activities, it will have the capability of assessing and fine-tuning SSIP implementation efforts incrementally, rather than waiting to see if annual targets have been met or missed. By using evaluation tools, mechanisms and systems designed to support LEA efforts to improve reading for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3, the WDE will be able to share ideas, best practices, and evaluation resources with schools and LEAs, and support them with technical assistance designed to build capacity for the development and implementation of their own data analysis systems.

### **Conclusion**

The Wyoming SSIP strategies address the potential root causes of low reading performance for students with disabilities in

preschools and grades K-3 identified by the WDE and its stakeholders in several ways. The Meaningful Professional Development and Technical Assistance strategy will focus on preschool teachers, general education teachers, and special education teachers, to ensure they have access to differentiated professional development and technical assistance activities designed to improve the knowledge and skills necessary to provide evidence-based, differentiated pre-literacy and reading instruction to students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3. This strategy is also designed to build state and LEA capacity to support, monitor and guide successful implementation systems. A strong emphasis will be placed on monitoring and providing follow-up technical assistance to preschool-level staff and administration. Through SSIP activities, preschool teachers and service providers will have access to evidence-based resources and meaningful professional development opportunities designed to improve the foundational reading skills of three- to five-year-olds.

Through the Use of Data and Evaluation Tools strategy, the WDE will continue to analyze data and work with stakeholders to identify the factors which contribute to low reading performance for students with disabilities who spend 21 to 60% of their school day outside the general education environment. Technical assistance and instructional resources will be customized to include evidence-based strategies specific to more restrictive educational settings in order to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum and that their teachers have the knowledge and skills necessary to remediate their unique skills deficits. Developing core implementation components, such as setting criteria for usable interventions, exploration, and installation, will be a major focus of the Wyoming SSIP Phase 2.

These strategies address the potential infrastructure gap of limited human capacity on several levels. Internal professional development, focused on improving knowledge and skills in the areas of evidence-based differentiated reading instructional practices, data analysis, implementation of IDEA regulations, and systems development, will help to rebuild the capacity of the WDE and address the loss of institutional knowledge. Scaling up professional development and technical assistance through the use of web-based technology will allow increased access to training activities without expending valuable staff resources and travel expenses.

The Aligned Resources strategy will address the need for more clearly defined systems, processes, and criteria. It will also address the need for additional focus, coordination and consistency in internal and external professional development and technical assistance activities. Through the development of well-defined operating procedures and the establishment of systemic processes, the WDE will deliver a more consistent message, internally and externally.

The Effective Use of Data and Evaluation Tools strategy will address the need for evaluation mechanisms and systems used to analyze quality, fidelity, and impact of improvement initiatives. The WDE is fortunate to have a robust longitudinal data system in place. The next step is to develop a coordinated system for using the rich data available to improve student outcomes. While the SSIP will focus on improving reading outcomes for students with disabilities in preschools and grades K-3, this strategy offers an opportunity to develop new data tools, processes, and systems to support preschools and LEAs in their efforts to improve educational outcomes for all students.

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

### Plan

#### Theory of Action

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: [Wyoming FFY2013 Part B SPP Theory of Action](#)

Illustration



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

**Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Leslie Bechtel Van Orman

Title: Interim State Special Education Director

Email: leslie.vanorman@wyo.gov

Phone: 307-857-9257