

# WY Part B

# FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

| Attachments               |           |             |               |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
|                           | File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
| No APR attachments found. |           |             |               |

48

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  |
|---|
| <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. WDE provides technical assistance to districts which focuses not only on the collection of data, but also on substantive analysis of data.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Fiscal  |
| <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>   |

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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. When the file review does not alleviate concerns regarding potential noncompliance, the team will conduct

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

interviews of district staff, parents or students. If areas of noncompliance are determined to exist during the on-site visit, a report is written, detailing the monitoring findings. 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.

### 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.

### Attachments

| File Name                 | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. |             |               |

### 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.

### Attachments

| File Name                 | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. |             |               |

### 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

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 drill down 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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### Attachments

| File Name                 | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. |             |               |

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

### STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Presentations were given during the Wyoming Administrators of Special Education Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. Results of this data analysis were shared with the WAPSD and WASEA. 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. 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.

### Attachments

| File Name                 | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. |             |               |

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, 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.

FFY2016 District reports are located at the following link under the "School District Report Cards" drop-down menu. <https://edu.wyoming.gov/in-the-classroom/special-programs/spp-apr/>

### Attachments

| File Name                 | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. |             |               |

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SIMR.

### Required Actions

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY      | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ |      |        | 48.50% | 49.00% | 49.00% | 49.50% | 50.00% | 50.50% | 51.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Data     |      | 50.60% | 52.10% | 59.72% | 66.29% | 66.29% | 62.89% | 57.20% | 58.68% | 59.00% | 61.81% |

| FFY      | 2015   |
|----------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 85.00% |
| Data     | 59.08% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets


| FFY      | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

| Source   | Date       | Description  | Data   | Overwrite Data  |
|--|------------|--|--------|---|
| SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696) | 10/12/2017 | <a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>        | 676    |   |
| SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696) | 10/12/2017 | <a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>                     | 1,048  | null  |
| SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)             | 10/12/2017 | <a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a> | 64.50% | Calculate  |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data | FFY 2016 Target | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 676   | 1,048  | 59.08%        | 85.00%          | 64.50%        |

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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)]

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions



FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out

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

| FFY      | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013  | 2014  |
|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| Target ≤ |      |        | 13.80% | 13.60% | 13.60% | 13.40% | 13.20% | 13.00% | 12.80% | 6.25% | 6.20% |
| Data     |      | 12.90% | 7.70%  | 7.08%  | 7.08%  | 5.52%  | 7.33%  | 5.82%  | 5.72%  | 6.08% | 5.56% |

| FFY      | 2015  |
|----------|-------|
| Target ≤ | 6.15% |
| Data     | 5.39% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY      | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≤ | 6.10% | 6.05% | 6.00% |

Key:

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.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- ☐ Option 1  
☐ Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of high school students with IEPs | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 188  | 3,454  | 5.39%          | 6.10%            | 5.44%         |

- ☒ Use a different calculation methodology
- ☐ Change numerator description in data table
- ☐ Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

WDE uses an event rate calculation for Indicator 2 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 in October of Year 2, and did not receive a diploma in Year 1.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.**

Students counted as not graduating in four years may have:

- 1) Dropped out, been rumored to transfer (no written confirmation), or left for reasons unknown by the school
- 2) Left school to participate in a non-high school diploma granting educational or trade program (including GED)
- 3) Attended high school grades (9-12) for 4 full years without graduating (may still be seeking a diploma in 5 or 6 years)

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response****Required Actions**

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

|         | Group Name      | Baseline Year | FFY      | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009 | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|---------|-----------------|---------------|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A<br>Elementary | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |      | 100%   | 100%   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 98.80% | 98.31% | 98.20% | 99.20% |      | 98.90% | 99.26% | 99.40% | 99.55% | 99.05% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |      | 100%   | 100%   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 97.80% | 97.26% | 97.80% | 98.20% |      | 98.60% | 99.32% | 99.00% | 99.12% | 98.86% |
|         | C<br>HS         | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |      | 100%   | 100%   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 95.50% | 93.50% | 97.20% | 97.90% |      | 97.20% | 96.30% | 92.40% | 89.59% | 89.42% |
| Math    | A<br>Elementary | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |      | 100%   | 100%   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 98.70% | 98.73% | 97.80% | 99.20% |      | 98.80% | 99.31% | 99.30% | 99.48% | 99.08% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |      | 100%   | 100%   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 97.90% | 97.60% | 97.26% | 98.10% |      | 98.50% | 99.22% | 99.00% | 99.12% | 98.81% |
|         | C<br>HS         | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |      | 100%   | 100%   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 95.20% | 95.25% | 93.50% | 98.10% |      | 97.30% | 96.78% | 92.70% | 89.59% | 89.55% |

|         | Group Name      | FFY      | 2015   |
|---------|-----------------|----------|--------|
| Reading | A<br>Elementary | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
|         |                 | Data     | 99.34% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
|         |                 | Data     | 98.70% |
|         | C<br>HS         | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
|         |                 | Data     | 94.67% |
| Math    | A<br>Elementary | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
|         |                 | Data     | 99.24% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
|         |                 | Data     | 98.70% |
|         | C<br>HS         | Target ≥ | 95.00% |
|         |                 | Data     | 94.67% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

|         | FFY               | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|---------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A ≥<br>Elementary | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         | B ≥<br>Middle     | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         | C ≥<br>HS         | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | A ≥<br>Elementary | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         | B ≥<br>Middle     | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
|         | C ≥<br>HS         | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Targets align with the WDE's ESEA Accountability Workbook.

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? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

| Reading assessment participation data by grade                |      |      |      |      |      |     |   |    |     |    |    |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|---|----|-----|----|----|
| Grade   | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11  | 12 | HS |
| a. Children with IEPs   | 1209 | 1228 | 1086 | 1077 | 1027 | 944 | n | n  | 714 | n  | n  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations          | 444  | 406  | 269  | 258  | 255  | 246 |   |    | 48  |    |    |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations             | 688  | 733  | 740  | 733  | 689  | 620 |   |    | 568 |    |    |
| d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards |      |      |      |      |      |     |   |    |     |    |    |
| e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards    |      |      |      |      |      |     |   |    |     |    |    |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards   | 71   | 83   | 68   | 77   | 72   | 71  |   |    | 50  |    |    |

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

| Math assessment participation data by grade                   |      |      |      |      |      |     |   |    |     |    |    |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|---|----|-----|----|----|
| Grade   | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11  | 12 | HS |
| a. Children with IEPs   | 1209 | 1228 | 1086 | 1077 | 1027 | 944 | n | n  | 714 | n  | n  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations          | 430  | 385  | 260  | 239  | 224  | 216 |   |    | 48  |    |    |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations             | 700  | 754  | 749  | 752  | 700  | 647 |   |    | 568 |    |    |
| d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards |      |      |      |      |      |     |   |    |     |    |    |
| e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards    |      |      |      |      |      |     |   |    |     |    |    |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards   | 71   | 83   | 68   | 79   | 72   | 71  |   |    | 50  |    |    |

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group Name      | Number of Children with IEPs | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A<br>Elementary | 4,600                        | 4,570                                      | 99.34%         | 95.00%           | 99.35%        |
| B<br>Middle     | 1,971                        | 1,953                                      | 98.70%         | 95.00%           | 99.09%        |
| C<br>HS         | 714                          | 666  | 94.67%         | 95.00%           | 93.28%        |

#### Reasons for Group C Slippage

The number of opportunities to take the grade 11 assessment (which is the ACT) is more limited than for students taking the elementary and middle school assessments. The WDE is working with school districts to implement strategies to increase participation rates. The WDE has examined the participation rate date of grade 11 students by districts and have identified those districts that had a decrease in their participation rates from 2015-16 to 2016-17. The WDE will follow-up with these districts to determine the reasons.

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group Name | Number of Children with | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
|------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

|                 | IEPs  | Participating |        |        |        |
|-----------------|-------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|
| A<br>Elementary | 4,600 | 4,570         | 99.24% | 95.00% | 99.35% |
| B<br>Middle     | 1,971 | 1,930         | 98.70% | 95.00% | 97.92% |
| C<br>HS         | 714   | 666           | 94.67% | 95.00% | 93.28% |

Reasons for Group C Slippage

The number of opportunities to take the grade 11 assessment (which is the ACT) is more limited than for students taking the elementary and middle school assessments. The WDE is working with school districts to implement strategies to increase participation rates. The WDE has examined the participation rate date of grade 11 students by districts and have identified those districts that had a decrease in their participation rates from 2015-16 to 2016-17. The WDE will follow-up with these districts to determine the reasons.

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:  
<https://portals.edu.wyoming.gov/Reports/Public/wde-reports-2012/public-reports/assessment/pawsresultsstatelevelaggregated>

District-level results are here:  
<https://portals.edu.wyoming.gov/Reports/Public/wde-reports-2012/public-reports/assessment/actsuiteaveragesdistrictlevel>

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Historical Data

|         | Group Name      | Baseline Year | FFY      | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009 | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|---------|-----------------|---------------|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A<br>Elementary | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 42.00% | 42.00% | 53.60% |      | 53.60% | 65.20% | 85.40% | 100%   | 100%   |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 29.50% | 37.50% | 33.50% | 32.20% |      | 43.10% | 45.94% | 40.90% | 28.03% | 26.35% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 45.42% | 45.42% | 56.33% |      | 56.33% | 67.25% | 79.70% | 100%   | 100%   |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 21.30% | 28.90% | 28.60% | 23.50% |      | 31.80% | 37.20% | 37.90% | 21.69% | 18.88% |
|         | C<br>HS         | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 57.00% | 57.00% | 56.60% |      | 65.60% | 74.20% | 34.70% | 100%   | 100%   |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 19.90% | 29.20% | 22.90% | 24.80% |      | 33.50% | 36.56% | 38.70% | 16.33% | 10.68% |
| Math    | A<br>Elementary | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 36.50% | 36.50% | 49.20% |      | 49.20% | 61.90% | 83.30% | 100%   | 100%   |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 40.60% | 61.60% | 51.30% | 51.20% |      | 58.50% | 59.94% | 56.90% | 25.85% | 24.37% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 37.75% | 37.75% | 50.20% |      | 50.20% | 62.65% | 75.20% | 100%   | 100%   |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 17.60% | 29.60% | 33.60% | 32.70% |      | 32.30% | 34.70% | 35.50% | 17.20% | 14.80% |
|         | C<br>HS         | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        | 46.50% | 46.50% | 57.20% |      | 57.20% | 67.90% | 69.50% | 100%   | 100%   |
|         |                 |               | Data     |      | 15.10% | 19.80% | 18.80% | 19.90% |      | 25.60% | 23.09% | 26.80% | 14.14% | 10.95% |

|         | Group Name      | FFY      | 2015   |
|---------|-----------------|----------|--------|
| Reading | A<br>Elementary | Target ≥ | 100%   |
|         |                 | Data     | 26.87% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | Target ≥ | 100%   |
|         |                 | Data     | 18.73% |
|         | C<br>HS         | Target ≥ | 100%   |
|         |                 | Data     | 14.69% |
| Math    | A<br>Elementary | Target ≥ | 100%   |
|         |                 | Data     | 26.35% |
|         | B<br>Middle     | Target ≥ | 100%   |
|         |                 | Data     | 15.26% |
|         | C<br>HS         | Target ≥ | 100%   |
|         |                 | Data     | 15.00% |

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

|         | FFY               | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------|-------------------|------|------|------|
| Reading | A ≥<br>Elementary | 100% | 100% | 100% |
|         | B ≥<br>Middle     | 100% | 100% | 100% |
|         | C ≥<br>HS         | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Math    | A ≥<br>Elementary | 100% | 100% | 100% |
|         | B ≥<br>Middle     | 100% | 100% | 100% |
|         | C ≥<br>HS         | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

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? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

| 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                                 | 1203 | 1222 | 1077 | 1068 | 1016 | 937 | n | n  | 666 | n  | n  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level          | 220  | 232  | 121  | 82   | 71   | 44  |   |    | n   |    |    |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level             | 65   | 93   | 92   | 74   | 74   | 63  |   |    | 53  |    |    |
| 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   | 52   | 64   | 54   | 61   | 54   | 55  |   |    | 39  |    |    |

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

| 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                                 | 1201 | 1222 | 1077 | 1070 | 996 | 934 | n | n  | 666 | n  | n  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level          | 192  | 201  | 122  | 72   | 59  | 43  |   |    | n   |    |    |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level             | 95   | 116  | 129  | 66   | 57  | 61  |   |    | 34  |    |    |
| 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   | 35   | 51   | 43   | 47   | 39  | 48  |   |    | 33  |    |    |

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|-----------------|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A<br>Elementary | 4,570  | 1,210                                   | 26.87%         | 100%             | 26.48%        |

## FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|-------------|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| B<br>Middle | 1,953  | 361                                     | 18.73%         | 100%             | 18.48%        |
| C<br>HS     | 666  | 96                                      | 14.69%         | 100%             | 14.41%        |

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|-----------------|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A<br>Elementary | 4,570  | 1,169                                   | 26.35%         | 100%             | 25.58%        |
| B<br>Middle     | 1,930  | 307                                     | 15.26%         | 100%             | 15.91%        |
| C<br>HS         | 666  | 71                                      | 15.00%         | 100%             | 10.66%        |

### Reasons for Group C Slippage

The WDE has examined the proficiency rates of grades 3-8 and 11 students by district to identify those districts that had a decrease from 2015-16 to 2016-17. Most districts saw a decrease in their proficiency rates, so it was not particular to a few districts. We will follow-up with the districts to see if they have some reasons as to why their scores might have decreased. In November 2017, the WDE did five regional data drill-downs across the state whereby districts were provided with disaggregated reports of their proficiency data by grade, gender, disability, placement, etc. so that the districts could identify areas of potential improvements in their data.

### 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:  
<https://portals.edu.wyoming.gov/Reports/Public/wde-reports-2012/public-reports/assessment/pawsresultsstatelevelaggregated>

District-level results are here:  
<https://portals.edu.wyoming.gov/Reports/Public/wde-reports-2012/public-reports/assessment/actsuiteaveragesdistrictlevel>

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

The slippage occurred across the state with students with disabilities and general education students. The state has been unable to determine the reason for the decrease in scores but the state will continue to look into the possible reasons for the slippage. The State is also moving to a new statewide assessment in the Spring of 2018.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions



FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

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: 2016

| FFY      | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≤ |      |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| Data     |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

| FFY      | 2015 |
|----------|------|
| Target ≤ | 0%   |
| Data     | 0%   |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY      | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|------|------|------|
| Target ≤ | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? ☒ Yes ☐ No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 3

| Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 0   | 46  | 0%             | 0%               | 0%            |

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 2016 state rate (based on 2015-16 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.55%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.55% 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 and 3 students in the numerator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged.

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

Of the 49 LEAs in Wyoming, none were identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2016 for Indicator 4A. In the entire state of Wyoming, only 88 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2016. Only 18 LEAs had a suspension rate greater than 0%, and none had a suspension rate greater than 5.55%. Three LEAs were excluded from the Indicator 4A analyses due to not having at least 25 students with disabilities enrolled at the district; however, all three of these districts had a 0% suspension rate.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The WDE did not have to do a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY 2016 due to no districts being identified with noncompliance.

- ☒ 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:

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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                                    | null  | null   | 0                                      |

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

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: 2016

| FFY    | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target |      |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| Data   |      |      |      |      |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

| FFY    | 2015 |
|--------|------|
| Target | 0%   |
| Data   | 0%   |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? ☒ Yes ☐ No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 3

| 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 0   | 0   | 46  | 0%             | 0%               | 0%            |

☒ 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 2016 state rate (based on 2015-16 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.55%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.55% 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 and 3 students in the numerator 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)

Of the 49 LEAs in Wyoming, none were identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2016 for Indicator 4B. In the entire state of Wyoming, only 88 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2016. For each of Wyoming's 49 LEAs, the WDE calculates a suspension and expulsion rate for each of the seven race and ethnicity reporting categories. (Note: many LEAs do not have members of every race and ethnicity reporting category enrolled in the LEA.) None were identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2016 for Indicator 4B. Only 18 LEAs had a suspension rate greater than 0%. Of these 18 LEAs, four were excluded for a given race/ethnicity rate because there were not at least 25 students in the denominator (for these LEAs, their suspension rate was 1 or 2 out of between 13-22 students). Two LEAs were excluded because they did not meet the minimum n of 3 students being suspended. This illustrates the very small numbers of students with disabilities for a particular racial/ethnic group in some Wyoming LEAs. Of the 49 LEAs, 46 had at least one ratio calculated for Indicator 4B that was based on at least 25 students.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The WDE did not have to do a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY 2016 due to no districts being flagged for potential noncompliance.

- ☐ 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:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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                                    | null  | null   | 0                                      |

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

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      | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|---|---------------|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2005          | Target ≥ |      |        |        | 57.30% | 57.40% | 57.50% | 58.00% | 58.50% | 60.00% | 61.84% | 62.09% |
|   |               | Data     |      | 54.30% | 57.32% | 59.60% | 60.50% | 60.59% | 62.27% | 60.59% | 62.17% | 61.84% | 65.21% |
| B | 2005          | Target ≤ |      |        |        | 9.48%  | 9.44%  | 9.39%  | 9.30%  | 9.28%  | 9.25%  | 7.25%  | 7.10%  |
|   |               | Data     |      | 9.15%  | 8.62%  | 8.33%  | 8.38%  | 8.24%  | 7.60%  | 7.10%  | 7.07%  | 7.09%  | 6.66%  |
| C | 2005          | Target ≤ |      |        |        | 2.44%  | 2.43%  | 2.42%  | 2.41%  | 2.40%  | 2.39%  | 1.34%  | 1.34%  |
|   |               | Data     |      | 2.63%  | 2.76%  | 2.43%  | 1.23%  | 1.39%  | 1.07%  | 2.19%  | 1.44%  | 1.34%  | 2.02%  |

|   | FFY      | 2015   |
|---|----------|--------|
| A | Target ≥ | 62.34% |
|   | Data     | 65.38% |
| B | Target ≤ | 7.00%  |
|   | Data     | 6.49%  |
| C | Target ≤ | 1.34%  |
|   | Data     | 2.00%  |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY        | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A ≥ | 62.59% | 62.84% | 63.09% |
| Target B ≤ | 7.00%  | 7.00%  | 6.75%  |
| Target C ≤ | 1.34%  | 1.34%  | 1.33%  |

Key:

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 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, 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.

Prepopulated Data

| Source   | Date      | Description   | Data   | Overwrite Data |
|--|-----------|---|--------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>  | 12,132 | null           |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>   | 8,111  | null           |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a> | 740    | null           |

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

| Source   | Date      | Description   | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|-----------|---|------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>              | 69   | null           |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>        | 132  | null           |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a> | 18   | null           |

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

|  | Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day  | 8,111   | 12,132   | 65.38%         | 62.59%           | 66.86%        |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day  | 740   | 12,132   | 6.49%          | 7.00%            | 6.10%         |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 219   | 12,132   | 2.00%          | 1.34%            | 1.81%         |

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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      | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|---|---------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2011          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        | 60.34% | 61.48% | 61.73% |
|   |               | Data     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 59.84% | 60.45% | 61.48% | 56.22% |
| B | 2011          | Target ≤ |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        | 31.30% | 29.01% | 28.76% |
|   |               | Data     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 30.80% | 30.94% | 29.01% | 33.89% |

|   | FFY      | 2015   |
|---|----------|--------|
| A | Target ≥ | 61.98% |
|   | Data     | 65.19% |
| B | Target ≤ | 28.51% |
|   | Data     | 25.25% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY        | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A ≥ | 62.23% | 62.48% | 62.73% |
| Target B ≤ | 28.26% | 28.01% | 27.76% |

Key:

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.

Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date      | Description  | Data  | Overwrite Data |
|---|-----------|--|-------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>  | 3,367 | 3,339          |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">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</a> | 2,195 | 2,000          |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>  | 286   | 777            |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>   | 564   | 252            |
| SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613) | 7/13/2017 | <a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>  | n     | n              |




FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Explanation of Alternate Data

There was an error in the C089 data that was originally submitted to EdFacts. A new file was submitted in January 2018.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

|   | Number of children with IEPs<br>aged 3 through 5 attending | Total number of children with IEPs<br>aged 3 through 5 | FFY 2015<br>Data* | FFY 2016<br>Target* | FFY 2016<br>Data |
|---|--|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| A. A regular early childhood program and<br>receiving the majority of special education<br>and related services in the regular early<br>childhood program | 2,000  | 3,339  | 65.19%            | 62.23%              | 59.90%           |
| B. Separate special education class,<br>separate school or residential facility   | 1,030  | 3,339  | 25.25%            | 28.26%              | 30.85%           |

 Use a different calculation methodology

Reasons for A Slippage

The WDE and the Behavioral Health Division (BHD) analyzed preschool environment data for children with IEPs aged 3 through 5. The data has been disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, grade, primary disability, and preschool region to determine the reasons for the decrease and to identify any technical assistance needs. In addition, preschool regions have been given their disaggregated Indicator 6 data as well so that they can determine what types of changes, if any, they can make to increase the percentage of children served with typically developing peers. In FFY 2015 IDEA Part B/619 preschool providers were instructed to use the IDEA Data Center developed decision tree to report preschool environments. With the additional guidance, preschools began to report more accurate settings, resulting in slippage. Most of the preschools believed they were classified as Regular Education environments. Where in fact, their ratios indicated they were more often serving students in a separate class or separate school due to a low amount of typically developing peers.

Reasons for B Slippage

The WDE and the Behavioral Health Division (BHD) analyzed preschool environment data for children with IEPs aged 3 through 5. The data has been disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, grade, primary disability, and preschool region to determine the reasons for the decrease and to identify any technical assistance needs. In addition, preschool regions have been given their disaggregated Indicator 6 data as well so that they can determine what types of changes, if any, they can make to increase the percentage of children served with typically developing peers. In FFY 2015 IDEA Part B/619 preschool providers were instructed to use the IDEA Data Center developed a decision tree to report preschool environments. With the additional guidance, preschools began to report more accurate settings, resulting in slippage. Most of the preschools believed they were classified as Regular Education environments. Where in fact, their ratios indicated they were more often serving students in a separate class or separate school due to a low amount of typically developing peers.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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      | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|----|---------------|----------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2008          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |        | 60.68% | 61.18% | 62.18% |        | 87.50% | 87.50% |
|    |               | Data     |      |      |      |      | 60.68% | 69.72% | 69.90% | 76.48% | 85.37% | 87.50% | 91.23% |
| A2 | 2008          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |        | 56.87% | 57.37% | 58.37% |        | 57.13% | 57.13% |
|    |               | Data     |      |      |      |      | 56.87% | 63.00% | 58.28% | 59.56% | 64.21% | 57.13% | 59.40% |
| B1 | 2008          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |        | 61.12% | 61.62% | 62.62% |        | 89.27% | 89.27% |
|    |               | Data     |      |      |      |      | 61.12% | 67.13% | 74.02% | 81.41% | 88.22% | 89.27% | 92.06% |
| B2 | 2008          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |        | 54.77% | 55.27% | 56.27% |        | 53.72% | 53.72% |
|    |               | Data     |      |      |      |      | 54.77% | 56.60% | 55.98% | 58.67% | 62.45% | 53.72% | 58.07% |
| C1 | 2008          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |        | 63.81% | 64.31% | 65.31% |        | 89.18% | 89.18% |
|    |               | Data     |      |      |      |      | 63.81% | 73.07% | 75.31% | 79.07% | 87.55% | 89.18% | 92.77% |
| C2 | 2008          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |        | 67.05% | 67.55% | 68.55% |        | 68.55% | 68.55% |
|    |               | Data     |      |      |      |      | 67.05% | 71.26% | 71.05% | 73.32% | 77.66% | 68.55% | 77.79% |

|    | FFY      | 2015   |
|----|----------|--------|
| A1 | Target ≥ | 87.60% |
|    | Data     | 90.76% |
| A2 | Target ≥ | 57.33% |
|    | Data     | 59.49% |
| B1 | Target ≥ | 89.37% |
|    | Data     | 92.57% |
| B2 | Target ≥ | 53.82% |
|    | Data     | 61.60% |
| C1 | Target ≥ | 89.28% |
|    | Data     | 91.56% |
| C2 | Target ≥ | 68.65% |
|    | Data     | 74.89% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY         | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 ≥ | 87.70% | 87.90% | 89.50% |
| Target A2 ≥ | 57.53% | 57.53% | 59.13% |
| Target B1 ≥ | 89.47% | 89.67% | 91.27% |
| Target B2 ≥ | 53.92% | 54.12% | 55.72% |
| Target C1 ≥ | 89.38% | 89.58% | 91.18% |
| Target C2 ≥ | 68.75% | 68.95% | 70.55% |

Key:

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 7/19/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed | 1303.00 |
|--|---------|

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

|   | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning   | 5.00               | 0.38%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 130.00             | 9.98%                  |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 396.00             | 30.39%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 626.00             | 48.04%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 146.00             | 11.20%                 |

|   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ | 1022.00   | 1157.00     | 90.76%         | 87.70%           | 88.33%        |
| 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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$   | 772.00    | 1303.00     | 59.49%         | 57.53%           | 59.25%        |

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

|   | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning   | 4.00               | 0.31%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 163.00             | 12.51%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 421.00             | 32.31%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 504.00             | 38.68%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 211.00             | 16.19%                 |

|   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ | 925.00    | 1092.00     | 92.57%         | 89.47%           | 84.71%        |
| 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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$   | 715.00    | 1303.00     | 61.60%         | 53.92%           | 54.87%        |

**Reasons for B1 Slippage**

To determine why there is slippage in B1, WDE examined results by the 14 regions to determine if this slippage was present in all 14 preschool regions or if it were particular to just certain regions. Data indicated that 9 of the 14 regions saw a decrease in their B1 score. The decrease was generally largest in those regions that were part of the pilot process for the improved scoring for Indicator 7 (see below for a description of this process). (However, one region not involved in the pilot process also saw a large decrease.) Thus, part of the decrease can be attributed to the pilot. In addition, the EIEP has focused on improving the reliability and validity of the COS process for the past year. In 2017-18, the EIEP is providing state-wide training on the assessment instrument used in the COS pilot and will continue to provide rater training on the 7-point rating scale. The new process will be utilized statewide by the beginning of July 2018.

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

|  | Number of | Percentage of |
|--|-----------|---------------|
|--|-----------|---------------|

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

|   | Children | Children |
|---|----------|----------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning   | 4.00     | 0.31%    |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 130.00   | 9.98%    |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 246.00   | 18.88%   |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 598.00   | 45.89%   |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 325.00   | 24.94%   |

|   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 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) | 844.00    | 978.00      | 91.56%         | 89.38%           | 86.30%        |
| 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)   | 923.00    | 1303.00     | 74.89%         | 68.75%           | 70.84%        |

## Reasons for C1 Slippage

To determine why there is slippage in C1, WDE examined results by the 14 regions to determine if this slippage was present in all 14 preschool regions or if it were particular to just certain regions. Data indicated that 9 of the 14 regions saw a decrease in their C1 score. The decrease was generally largest in those regions that were part of the pilot process for the improved scoring for Indicator 7 (see below for a description of this process). (However, one region not involved in the pilot process also saw a large decrease.) Thus, part of the decrease can be attributed to the pilot. In addition, the EIEP has focused on improving the reliability and validity of the COS process for the past year. In 2017-18, the EIEP is providing state-wide training on the assessment instrument used in the COS pilot and will continue to provide rater training on the 7-point rating scale. The new process will be utilized statewide by the beginning of July 2018.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

## List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The EIEP and WDE require that regional Preschool Development Centers use one or more of the following assessments annually to track child progress on each of the three preschool outcomes areas:

- Battelle Development Inventory
- Brigance Inventory of Early Development
- Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum for Ages 3-5 or,
- Other tools approved by the EIEP.

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

In 2016-17, three preschool regions piloted a new process for measasuring progress on the three outcomes areas. These three regions used the Battelle Development Inventory. The scoring process entails converting the z-score on a given domain area to the 7-point Child Outcome Rating scale. Exit scores on the 7-point rating scale are then compared to entry scores on the 7-point rating scale to determine which of the five OSEP progress categories (a, b, c, d, or e) in which a given student falls, using the same calculation method as that used for the ECO Child Outcomes Summary process.

## Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

## OSEP Response

**Required Actions**

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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      | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ |      |        | 52.15% | 52.55% | 53.55% | 54.55% | 56.55% |        | 80.35% | 74.61% | 74.89% |
| Data     |      | 51.28% | 58.60% | 64.75% | 68.79% | 73.45% | 72.13% | 79.85% | 70.71% | 74.61% | 75.47% |

| FFY      | 2015   |
|----------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 75.14% |
| Data     | 80.22% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY      | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 75.39% | 75.64% | 75.89% |

Key:

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.

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 993.00   | 1264.00  | 80.22%         | 75.39%           | 78.56%        |

|   |        |         |
|---|--------|---------|
| The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed. | 25.64% | 4930.00 |
|---|--------|---------|

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

7/19/2018

Page 30 of 73

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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, 33% of the PreK-12 parents who returned a survey indicated that their children's primary disability is a speech/language impairment, and 39% of PreK-12 special education students have a speech impairment. Furthermore, 82% of parent respondents indicated that their student is White, and 79% 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

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 upon 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  
201-1000 100  
1000+ 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.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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    | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target |      |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| Data   |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

| FFY    | 2015 |
|--------|------|
| Target | 0%   |
| Data   | 0%   |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? 

☒ Yes ☐ No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 0

| 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 that met the State's minimum n-size | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1  | 0   | 48  | 0%             | 0%               | 0%            |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? 

☒ Yes ☐ No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The Wyoming Department of Education collects the data used for Indicator 9 through the October 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).

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.

For Indicator 9, all 48 public K-12 school districts are included in the analyses. Of these 48 LEAs, 48 met the minimum n requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group). Please note that many LEAs in Wyoming have fewer than five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent the State from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 9, the WDE conducts its review of district data through the desk audit portion of Wyoming's Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System. All districts that have been flagged are required to provide the WDE with district policies and procedures concerning their identification practices. The WDE then conducts a file review to gather additional data on how the district's practices regarding the appropriate evaluation and identification of students with disabilities has affected actual students in the over-represented group.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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                                    | null  | null   | 0                                      |

### OSEP Response

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. However, the State did not change its baseline to account for this change in calculation methodology.

### Required Actions

In its FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must revise its baseline for this indicator.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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: 2016

| FFY    | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target |      |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| Data   |      | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

| FFY    | 2015 |
|--------|------|
| Target | 0%   |
| Data   | 0%   |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? 

Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 5

| 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 that met the State's minimum n-size | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1  | 0   | 43  | 0%             | 0%               | 0%            |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? 

Yes  No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The Wyoming Department of Education collects the data used for Indicator 10 through the October 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).

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.

For Indicator 10, all of Wyoming's 48 K-12 public school districts are included in the analyses. Of these 48 LEAs, 43 met the minimum n requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group times the six primary disability categories). Please note that many LEAs in Wyoming have fewer than five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity; when this is disaggregated further by type of primary disability, the numbers get extremely small. Thus, very small numbers prevent the State from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group by disability in every LEA.

7/19/2018

Page 34 of 73

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 10, the WDE conducts its review of district data through the desk audit portion of Wyoming's Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System. All districts that have been flagged are required to provide the WDE with district policies and procedures concerning their identification practices. The WDE then conducts a file review to gather additional data on how the district's practices regarding the appropriate evaluation and identification of students with disabilities has affected actual students in the over-represented group.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| 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                                    | null  | null   | 0                                      |

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 11: Child Find

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    | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   |      | 95.00% | 97.00% | 87.40% | 91.10% | 97.30% | 98.71% | 97.76% | 97.69% | 98.22% | 98.57% |

| FFY    | 2015   |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   |
| Data   | 98.68% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 3,972   | 3,906  | 98.68%         | 100%             | 98.34%        |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b] | 66 |
|---|----|

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 3,972 initial evaluations under Part B conducted during FFY 2016, there were 66 that did not meet the 60-day timeline requirement. Of these 66, 11 were from the State's 48 public school districts, and 55 were from the State's developmental preschools. The range in days beyond the 60-day timeline was 1 to 130 days. Reasons for the delay: delays in evaluations; parental cancellation of meetings; difficulty contacting parents; weather; incorrect calculation of 60-day timeline. Further technical assistance will be provided to LEAs to assist with compliance in this area.

### 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. (WDE-684C)

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In FFY2015, 98.67% of initial evaluations were completed on time; in FFY206, 98.64% were completed on time. While this is not a statistically significant difference, the WDE strives for continuous improvement each year. Every year, each district in the state and each developmental preschool receives their indicator 11 data for the past five years so that they can examine trends. In examining the FFY2016 data, the decrease in the results was mainly due to the developmental preschools having a lower on-time evaluation rate in FFY2016 than in FFY2015. The developmental preschools have already examined their data and have developed strategies to improve the process for initial evaluations.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 48                                   | 48  | 0  | 0                                      |

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Regarding the 48 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. In addition, the WDE also required an assurance that the district's policies and procedures concerning initial evaluations have been reviewed with district staff members during the 2016-17 school year. 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 2016 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 the self-assessment are provided TA, if needed.

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

All noncompliance for the FFY2015 (the 48 evaluations) were timely corrected within the one-year timeframe. Each district with noncompliance in FFY2015 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.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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    | 2004 | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013 | 2014 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|
| Target |      |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100% | 100% |
| Data   |      | 68.29% | 90.50% | 89.80% | 91.40% | 95.00% | 98.00% | 94.40% | 95.70% | 100% | 100% |

| FFY    | 2015   |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   |
| Data   | 91.64% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.   | 493 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.  | 59  |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.   | 376 |
| d. Number of children 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.                     | 7   |
| e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 2   |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0   |

|  | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 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-f)]x100 | 376           | 425                     | 91.64%         | 100%             | 88.47%        |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 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, or f | 49 |
|--|----|

Reasons for Slippage

The data will be examined by preschool region to determine for which regions the delays occurred. Technical assistance will then be provided to these preschool regions.

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

There are 49 children for whom their Part B eligibility was not determined by their third birthday. The days after their third birthday ranged from 1 day to over a year. Reasons for the delays included parent request, sick child, difficulty contacting parent, parent canceling meeting, and additional testing needed.

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

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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 45                                   | 45  | 0  | 0                                      |

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Regarding the 45 initial evaluations that were not completed within 60 days, the WDE requires specific corrective action from any preschool region exhibiting a rate below 100% compliance. First, the Department contacts each preschool region with the student identification numbers of students whose initial evaluations were late. In each instance, the region is required to provide an explanation for the delay. The BHD issues a letter containing findings for each of the students in whose case the transition from Part C to Part B was late. Regions 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 BHD. In addition, the WDE also required an assurance that the region's policies and procedures concerning initial evaluations have been reviewed with region staff members during the 2016-17 school year.

Preschool regions found out of compliance on the self-assessment are provided TA, if needed.

All findings have been verified as Corrected.

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

All noncompliance for the FFY2015 (the 45 evaluations) were timely corrected within the one-year timeframe. Each region with noncompliance in FFY2015 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. 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 LEA's 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).

### OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2016 data represent slippage from the FFY 2015 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2016 target for this indicator. Although the State indicated that the data would be reviewed in the future to determine slippage, the State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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    | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target |      |      | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   |      |      |      |      |      | 54.58% | 80.39% | 82.06% | 96.38% | 95.22% | 94.32% |

| FFY    | 2015   |
|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   |
| Data   | 87.29% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 370   | 395   | 87.29%         | 100%             | 93.67%        |

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 student files from each district in the state; between 1-10 files are reviewed for each district. An internal Continuous Improvement Team reviews each of the files using the NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist Form A. A file that meets all of the applicable checklist criteria is deemed as meeting Indicator 13. Findings of non-compliance are reviewed with LEAs who are then required to resolve areas of non-compliance and resubmit files to include all corrections. Additional files are requested in round two to ensure compliance specific to Indicator 13. Further technical assistance and resource tools are provided to those districts identified as having needs in this area. Formal letters are distributed to all LEA's who meet compliance specific to this indicator.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- ☒ Yes ☐ No



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 52                                   | 52  | 0  | 0                                      |

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

*Describe how the State verified that the source of 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 2015. The WDE's review of these students' documentation during the spring of 2016 demonstrated that the LEAs in question were following compliant IEP transition practices.

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

As reported in the State's FFY 2015 APR under Indicator 13, the WDE made 52 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 2015. The LEAs in question were required to submit Prior Written Notice forms and revised IEPs detailing the corrections made on each student's behalf.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

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      | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014   |
|---|---------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2013          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |      |        | 40.00% | 40.30% | 41.00% | 26.18% | 26.43% |
|   |               | Data     |      |      |      |      |      | 40.00% | 50.57% | 35.09% | 31.56% | 26.18% | 28.44% |
| B | 2013          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |      |        | 61.50% | 61.80% | 62.50% | 58.12% | 58.37% |
|   |               | Data     |      |      |      |      |      | 61.54% | 68.18% | 56.73% | 63.46% | 58.12% | 63.03% |
| C | 2013          | Target ≥ |      |      |      |      |      |        | 72.30% | 72.60% | 73.30% | 72.77% | 73.27% |
|   |               | Data     |      |      |      |      |      | 72.31% | 77.27% | 70.18% | 79.07% | 72.77% | 80.57% |

|   | FFY      | 2015   |
|---|----------|--------|
| A | Target ≥ | 26.68% |
|   | Data     | 29.55% |
| B | Target ≥ | 58.62% |
|   | Data     | 55.40% |
| C | Target ≥ | 73.77% |
|   | Data     | 71.31% |

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY        | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A ≥ | 26.93% | 27.18% | 27.43% |
| Target B ≥ | 58.87% | 59.12% | 59.37% |
| Target C ≥ | 74.27% | 74.77% | 75.75% |

Key:

### 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.

### FFY 2016 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   | 473.00 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 125.00 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 146.00 |
| 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)                         | 39.00  |
| 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). | 27.00  |

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

|  | Number of<br>respondent youth | Number of<br>respondent youth<br>who are no longer in<br>secondary school and<br>had IEPs in effect at<br>the time they left<br>school | FFY 2015<br>Data* | FFY 2016<br>Target* | FFY 2016<br>Data |
|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1)  | 125.00                        | 473.00   | 29.55%            | 26.93%              | 26.43%           |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one<br>year of leaving high school (1 +2)   | 271.00                        | 473.00   | 55.40%            | 58.87%              | 57.29%           |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary<br>education or training program; or competitively employed or in some<br>other employment (1+2+3+4) | 337.00                        | 473.00   | 71.31%            | 74.27%              | 71.25%           |

### Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- ☐ Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- ☐ Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

### Reasons for A Slippage

The WDE has examined the Indicator 14A rate by district to identify those districts that had a decrease from 2015-16 to 2016-17. Almost one-half of districts saw a decrease in their 14A rate, so it was not particular to a few districts. We will follow-up with these districts to see if they have some reasons as to why the percentage of exiting students going on to higher education might have decreased. In November 2017, the WDE did five regional data drill-downs across the state whereby districts were provided with disaggregated reports of their Indicator 14 data by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and exit code so that the districts could identify areas of potential improvements in their data. Districts were also provided with disaggregated information on who went on to higher education and who did not and were encouraged to closely examine this data and determine why their scores surrounding Indicator 14A decreased.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

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

The response rates were analyzed by the demographic characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of exit to determine if one group was more likely to respond than another group. No significant differences existed in response rates by gender or ethnicity; minor differences were found by primary disability. However, students who dropped out (43%) were significantly less likely to respond than students who graduated with a regular diploma (69%). That said, in previous years, the response rate for drop-outs had been under 20%. In the past two years, WDE has doubled the response rate of students who dropped out. The strategy that WDE has used to increase the drop-out response rate has been to have districts do their own calls. This has also increased the response rate of students who graduated from under 40% to over 60%. Because of the dramatic increase in response rate, WDE is confident that the current year results are representative on the state. However, WDE will continue to try to increase the response rate of the exiting students, particularly of students who dropped out, by (1) encouraging the last few districts who are not doing their own calls, to do so; and (2) conducting a webinar with the districts doing their own calls on strategies for contacting hard-to-reach exiters.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2016 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

The data is representative of the population.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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      | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011   | 2012   | 2013 | 2014 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|------|------|
| Target ≥ |      |      |      | 100% |      |      |      | 100%   |        |      |      |
| Data     |      | 100% | 100% | 0%   |      | 0%   |      | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0%   | 100% |

| FFY      | 2015 |
|----------|------|
| Target ≥ |      |
| Data     | 100% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY      | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ |      |      |      |

Key:

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.

Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date      | Description  | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|-----------|--|------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/1/2017 | <a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a> | n    | null           |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/1/2017 | <a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>  | n    | null           |

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 0  | 0                                 | 100%           |                  | 0%            |

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.



FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation

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      | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009   | 2010 | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   | 2014 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| Target ≥ |      |      | 100% | 100% |      |        | 100% | 100%   |        |        |      |
| Data     |      | 100% | 100% | 100% |      | 66.67% |      | 16.67% | 85.71% | 60.00% | 100% |

| FFY      | 2015 |
|----------|------|
| Target ≥ |      |
| Data     | 100% |

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY      | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ |      |      |      |

Key:

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.

Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date      | Description   | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|-----------|---|------|----------------|
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | <a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>     | n    | null           |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | <a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a> | n    | null           |
| SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/1/2017 | <a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>   | n    | null           |

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 2   | 1   | 3                   | 100%           |                  | 100%          |

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.



FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

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.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

| FFY      | 2013  | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ |       | 4.40% | 4.80% | 5.20% |
| Data     | 4.40% | 5.10% | 5.00% | 2.92% |

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY      | 2017  | 2018  |
|----------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 6.00% | 8.40% |

Key:

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 |
| 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.



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.

Overview

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

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:

| <b>Data Source</b>  | <b>Purpose</b>  |
|---|---|
| 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  |
| 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.   |

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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><br><br>Graduation Rates | HI 90%; VI 80%; BI 75%;<br><br>72% SWD non-free & reduced lunch | <u>Overall Graduation:</u><br><br>Students with disabilities (SWD) 59% vs. 81% students without disabilities<br><br>SS 9%; SF 22%; SC 19%; ED 46%;<br><br><u>Ethnicity:</u><br><br>White 63% vs. Native 41%<br><br><u>Environment:</u><br><br>Regular classroom 73% vs. RR 53%<br><br><u>Environment RE vs. RR:</u><br><br>ED 61% vs. 38%<br><br>HL 73% vs. 43%<br><br>LD 74% vs. 56% |

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

|   |                       |   |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Indicator 2</b><br><br>Dropout Rates | HI 0%; VI 0%; MU 9.1% | Overall SWD 28% (snap shot)<br><br>ELL 53%; ED 51%; Native American 41%<br><br>FRL 34% dropped out vs. 18% dropped out non-FRL<br><br><u>Rates of note:</u><br><br>Students with ED in regular classroom: 36%<br><br>Students with ED in resource room: 62%<br><br>Students with ED in separate classroom: 100%<br><br>Students with ED in separate facilities: 33%<br><br>Students with ED in court-placed settings: 60% |
|---|-----------------------|---|

| Area of Focus                                  | Areas of Strength  | Areas of Concern   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Indicator 3</b><br><br>Statewide Assessment |  | Despite changes in the test and CCSS, the gap between performance of SWD and non-disabled students remains similar to previous years.<br><br>All areas of concern in Graduation Rates also are present in performance, especially significant in students with LD.<br><br><u>Overall state reading proficiency rates</u><br><br>Students in regular classroom, reading: 29% vs. Students in RR 6%<br><br>Ethnicity: White = 24% vs.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American = 15%</li> <li>• Hispanic = 13%</li> <li>• Native American = 7%</li> </ul> -<br><br><u>Environment by disability:</u><br><br>SL students in RE: 63% proficient. SL students in RR: 13% proficient.<br><br>HL students in RE: 48% proficient. HL students in RR: 24% proficient.<br><br>LD students in RE: 38% proficient. LD students in RR: 14% proficient.<br><br>Homeless = 14% proficient vs. 22%; math 8% vs. 19%<br><br>If ED, HL, LD, or FRL and RR = 5% |
| <b>Indicator 4</b><br><br>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. | Overall state rate = 4.6% of SWDs were suspended for ≥3 days<br><br>Homeless 5.1%<br><br><u>Ethnicity</u>  |

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <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> |
| <p><b>Indicator 5</b></p> <p>Least Restrictive Environment</p>                  | <p>Overall 5A rate has increased from 56% (in 2005-06) to 65% (2013-14).</p>                                       | <p>24% of white students placed in RR vs. 29% Hispanic</p> <p>13% of grade 1 students in RR vs. 33% of grade 10</p> <p>9% SL vs. 34% students with LD</p> <p>24% ED    29%HL</p>  |
| <b>Area of Focus</b>  | <b>Areas of Strength</b>   | <b>Areas of Concern</b>   |
| <p><b>Indicator 6</b></p> <p>Pre-school LRE</p>                                 | <p>6A and 6B rates have slightly improved over time.</p>   | <p>6A and 6B rates vary significantly by preschool region.</p>  |
| <p><b>Indicator 7</b></p> <p>Pre-school skills</p>                              | <p>The percentage of students showing growth has significantly increased over time on all three outcome areas.</p> | <p>The percentage of students exiting at age level has stayed the same over time on all three outcome areas.</p>  |
| <p><b>Indicator 8</b></p> <p>Parent Involvement</p>                             | <p>The parent involvement rate has increased from 53% in 2005-06 to 75% in 2013-14.</p>                            | <p>Parents of preschool students are more positive than parents of K-12.</p>  |
| <p><b>Indicator 9</b></p> <p>Disproportionate Identification</p>                | <p>We have not had any inappropriate identification issues.</p>  | <p>N/A</p>  |
| <p><b>Indicator 10</b></p> <p>Disproportionate Racial/Ethnic Representation</p> | <p>We have not had any inappropriate identification issues.</p>  | <p>One district flagged for African American ED, but cleared upon review of evaluation and eligibility procedures</p>   |
| <p><b>Indicator 11</b></p> <p>Child Find 60 days</p>                            | <p>Indicator 11 rate has increased from 75% in 2005-06 to 98% in 2013-14.</p>                                      | <p>N/A</p>  |

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Indicator 12</b><br>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><br>Post-secondary Transition Planning | The indicator 13 rate has increased from 51% in 2005-06 to 95% in 2013-14.  | N/A  |
| <b>Indicator 14</b><br>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><br>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> <p>LD rate is 26%</p> <p>HL rate is 29%</p> <p>ED rate is 33%</p>                                |

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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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-ld 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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### 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



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 designed 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.

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)

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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.

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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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><br><br><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> </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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

|  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>students' academic progress as they move to different school districts, saving teachers valuable time as they wait on student records</li> </ul>  |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>with low incidence disabilities.</li> <li>IEP forms trainings for LEAs and other educational agencies</li> <li>Regional Data Share Out events</li> <li>Developing and implementing corrective action plans</li> <li>Developing and implementing compliance agreements</li> <li>Planned regional technical assistance presentations and related materials</li> <li>Guidance documents posted on the website</li> <li>Technical assistance online PowerPoint presentations</li> <li>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.)</li> <li>Training and coaching to assist the BHD in implementing a performance based monitoring system</li> <li>Responses to telephone and email inquiries made by staff from preschools, LEAs, other educational agencies, and parents</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> |
| <b>Element 2:</b><br><br><b>Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information,</b> such as attendance, special education, gifted and talented education, career and technical education, or free and reduced-priced lunch status. | <p>Student-level information beyond test scores is essential to lay the foundation to build tools like early warning systems, inform pedagogy and interventions, and evaluate the effects of schools and programs.</p> <p><i>With student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the extent to which free and reduced-price lunch enrollment drops off in high school and how that might affect measures of each high school's poverty rate</li> <li>how the percentage of minority students in gifted and talented programs compares with that of white students</li> <li>the rate at which English language learners are entering the state for the first time in high school and how are they doing on the state's high school exit exams</li> </ul>  | ü |  | <p>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.</p>  |
| <b>Element 3: The ability to match individual students' test records from year to year</b> in a statewide database of individual student performance and the ability to disaggregate the results by individual test item and objective.                      | <p>The ability to match individual student test records provides good diagnostic information to teachers and is also foundational to calculating student growth. Using test information at an aggregate level, the state and external researchers can conduct research and program evaluation in order to determine what's working for the state's students</p> <p><i>With the ability to match individual student performance records across years to follow student progress, policymakers and educators will know the following by grade and subject:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>percentage of last year's below-proficient students who met the state's proficiency standard this year</li> <li>whether or not proficient and advanced students are achieving at least a year's growth every year</li> <li>which learning objectives may require teachers to provide further instruction to students or educator professional development programs to better align their offerings with students' needs</li> </ul> | ü |  | <p>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.</p>  |
| <b>Element 4: Information on untested students and the reasons they were not tested.</b>   | <p>By matching information on untested students to other information, like attendance and program participation, it is possible to identify patterns associated with specific student subgroups and ensure that all students are held to high expectations.</p> <p><i>With information on untested students, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>which students, by grade and subject,</li> </ul>   | ü |  | <p><b>Monitoring/Accountability</b></p> <p>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</p>  |



|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>were not tested and why, to ensure that all students' needs are addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>trends over time in the number and percentage of untested students from each student subgroup, such as English language learners, special education students, economically disadvantaged students, or migratory students</li> <li>whether or not particular schools and school districts have excessive absences on test day or unusual patterns of absences and exemptions across years</li> </ul>  |  |  | <p>supervision structure and includes four major components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stable assessment</li> <li>District self-assessment</li> <li>Annual internal compliance review</li> <li>Risk-based assessment</li> <li>On-site focused monitoring</li> <li>On-site random and special monitoring</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>SEA Capacity</b></p> <p>The WDE utilized the SEA Capacity Rubric (Harsh, S. (2010). <i>Gaining perspective on a complex task: A multidimensional approach to capacity building</i>. 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human capacity - number of staff allocated for implementation and intellectual proficiency (knowledge, expertise, and understanding) needed to implement an initiative</li> <li>Organizational capacity – interaction, collaboration, and communication among stakeholders</li> <li>Structural capacity - The elements of the organization that exists independent of the persons who work within the system such as policies, procedures, and practices</li> <li>Material capacity – fiscal resources, materials, and equipment that the organization uses to implement the initiative</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Element 5: A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students</b> by classroom and subject.</p>  | <p>Collecting data about teachers and their students makes it possible to identify which students and courses are being taught by teachers with different levels and types of preparation or certification, and which forms of teacher training and certification have the greatest impact on students' academic growth in the classroom. This makes it possible to identify effective teachers, professional development, and teacher preparation programs, so the state can do more of what works and improve overall teacher effectiveness.</p> <p><i>With a teacher identifier and the ability to connect teacher and student data, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the teacher preparation programs that produce graduates whose students have the strongest academic growth</li> <li>how the experience levels of teachers in the district's high-poverty schools compare with those of teachers in the schools serving affluent students, and how these experience levels are related to the academic growth of the students in their classrooms</li> <li>the relationship between the performance of the school district's economically disadvantaged students on the state algebra exam and teacher preparation in that subject</li> </ul> |  | <p>ü</p> <p>DDE has worked with districts that provide teacher-student information, however, the Division of Individual Learning has not ever done this. It is certainly possible.</p>                   |  |
| <p><b>Element 6: Collect student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned.</b> This information includes student-level information from middle and high school that shows courses taken and grades earned.</p> | <p>Student-level transcript information ensures that states can understand the impact of college- and career-readiness policies that encourage all students—especially those who are English language learners, economically disadvantaged, migratory, special education, or minority students—to take rigorous courses and be better prepared for post-secondary and careers.</p> <p><i>With student-level transcript information, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>number and percentage of students who are enrolling in and completing rigorous courses in high school, disaggregated by student subgroup</li> <li>middle schools that are doing the best job of preparing students for rigorous courses in high school</li> <li>whether or not students in more</li> </ul>  |  | <p>ü</p> <p>This is possible. DDE has worked with districts that provide teacher-student information, however, the Division of Individual Learning has not ever done this. It is certainly possible.</p> |  |

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

|  |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
|  | rigorous courses in high school have been more successful in college or in the workplace  |   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political capacity - Enabling legislation and the support of executive leadership</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Element 7: Student-level college readiness test scores</b> , such as scores on SAT, SAT II, ACT, Advanced Placement (AP), and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams. | <p>Rigorous exams like ACT, SAT, AP, and IB are important indicators of students' college readiness and provide states with a picture of how well their students are prepared for education after high school.</p> <p><i>With student-level college readiness test scores, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>how participation rates and scores on SAT, ACT, AP, and IB exams change over time for students from different subgroups</li> <li>percentage of students who meet the proficiency standard on the state eighth-grade test who also take AP or IB courses in high school and pass the corresponding AP or IB exams</li> <li>percentage of students who met the proficiency standard on the state high school test who take the SAT and ACT exams and score at college readiness benchmark levels on those exams</li> </ul>  | ü |   | <p>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.</p> <p>The WDE Division of Individual Learning currently employs 25 people at the director, supervisor, consultant, and administrative support levels.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> |
| <b>Element 8: Student-level graduation and dropout data.</b>   | <p>The calculation of accurate graduation rates requires the ability to correctly account for students who leave public education and provides the clearest picture of whether students graduate, drop out, or move. For example, states must be able to distinguish between departing students who drop out from students who transfer to another school or school district.</p> <p><i>With good graduation and dropout data and the ability to match records to other databases, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>when students leave the state's public education system</li> <li>the state's four-year adjusted cohort high school graduation rate (calculated according to the 2005 National Governors Association compact)</li> <li>schools and school districts that are doing the best job reducing the dropout rate</li> <li>characteristics of high school dropouts and whether or not there are early warning signs that schools can look for in elementary and middle school</li> </ul> | ü |   |  |
| <b>Element 9: The ability to match student records between the P-12 and higher education systems.</b>  | <p>As a result of federal requirements, including the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program and ESEA waivers, states are required to publicly report data by high school on students' success in college as high-school feedback reports, which provide school and district leaders a clear picture of how their students perform after graduation. The ability to match student records across P-20 is critical to creating these valuable reports.</p> <p><i>With the ability to match student records</i></p>  |   | ü |  |

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

|  |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
|  | <p><i>between P-12 and higher education systems, policymakers and educators know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>percentage of each school district's high school graduates who enrolled in college</li> <li>percentage of last year's graduates from each high school or school district who needed remediation in college and how these percentages varied by student subgroup</li> <li>percentage of students who met the proficiency standard on the state high school assessment but needed remediation in the same subject in college</li> <li>how students' ability to stay in and complete college is related to their high school courses, grades, and test scores</li> </ul>  |   | <p>The WDE is able to link preschool through grade 12, but do not have a way to link to college records at this time.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Element 10: A state data audit system that assesses data quality, validity, and reliability.</b></p> | <p>Without a well-designed and well-implemented state data audit system, the public cannot have confidence in the quality of the information coming out of the state's public education system.</p> <p><i>With a robust data audit system in place, policymakers and educators will know the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether or not the disaggregated student information used to rate schools for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or other measures, such as Annual Measurable Objectives, is valid</li> <li>school districts that do the best job of reporting valid and reliable dropout data</li> <li>Whether or not school districts are reporting their numbers of untested students and reasons for not testing the students</li> <li>amount and type of data quality problems identified by school districts and how those problems are being addressed</li> </ul> | ü | <p>The WDE has various edit checks in place, however, there are still concerns about data accuracy and validity.</p>      |  |

## 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 ECRT, 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



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### 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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### 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:** No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

### Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SiMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SiMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See the revised Theory of Action (WYSSIPTOA.pdf) for reference throughout the document.

During this reporting period, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) chose and began to implement the evidence-based practice Data Based Individualization (DBI). DBI is a systematic method for using data to determine when and how to provide more intensive intervention to students. Teachers use progress-monitoring data to evaluate a student's response to intervention and use that information to move to the next component if needed. With DBI training, teachers will provide individually differentiated instruction to students who fit our SiMR (State Identified Measurable Result), or those who may potentially be at risk in reading once they reach third grade. The implementation of DBI will result in progress toward the SiMR goal.

To achieve the SiMR through DBI implementation, WDE has identified four schools, based on data, to pilot the DBI implementation process. In preparation for developing the pilot, WDE was engaged in many activities to build the infrastructure.

WDE created an interagency SSIP team that consisted of members from WDE and the Behavioral Health Division (BHD), a key stakeholder for early childhood special education. The team collaborated to identify DBI as an evidence-based practice with the assistance of American Institute for Research (AIR).

WDE identified four target schools, representing four school districts, to pilot the DBI implementation project. Pilot sites were identified based on the population of students within the district that fit the SiMR focus. Some students were currently receiving instruction in the resource room (RR). Using data, other students were identified as at-risk and may potentially be removed from the regular classroom for reading by the time they enter the third grade. The SSIP team reached out to Districts, Special Education Directors, Principals and Special Education teachers of targeted students to solicit participation in the pilot. The pilot teachers participate in DBI training modules to assist them in the implementation of DBI. In addition to the DBI module sessions, the pilot teachers take part in a monthly Professional Learning Community (PLC) that is exclusive to the special education teachers piloting the DBI process.

AIR developed the DBI module training. WDE is offering these modules to a select group of participants. The participants include: the pilot special education teachers, special education and general education teachers within the pilot schools, other teachers within the district, and other teachers outside the pilot districts throughout the state, including Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) coaches interested in implementing DBI.

WDE, through the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), has an existing infrastructure in place to support MTSS. MTSS is a school-wide framework that integrates assessment and intervention to maximize student academic achievement and reduce behavior problems. By aligning SPDG activities and SSIP DBI implementation, WDE can leverage more funds and personnel to achieve the SiMR goal. Using DBI as our evidence-based practice within the existing framework of MTSS, will increase participation in current and future implementation cohorts.

Furthermore, WDE has written both MTSS and the SiMR into the ESSA state plan to achieve the identified focus area of increasing third grade reading proficiency assuring current infrastructure accomplishments can continue to be utilized going forward. The interagency SSIP state team has also collaborated with other WDE divisions to establish communication tools that can be used by other stakeholders to provide a unified and accurate front of information across the state.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See the action strand activities document (WYSSIPActionStrandActivities.pdf) for a list of activities that have been and will be conducted for the SSIP.

Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress

The SSIP team set up initial project meetings with each pilot site. WDE and the external trainer met with Special Education Teachers, Special Education Directors, and principals to kick off the pilot phase. The intent was to provide a face to face opportunity for each pilot site to meet the SSIP team, discuss the expectations of the program, and provide guidance on the DBI implementation. It also allowed time for the school staff and for the external trainer to share and gather baseline data for evaluation purposes. (see documents; DBI Weekly Implementation Log.pdf and DBI Implementation Checklist.pdf)

Available to the four identified pilot schools are the initial onsite support, web-based professional development, and a defined DBI PLC. The selected group of special education teachers who will work directly with identified students will attend DBI training modules presented by the external trainer. Following each training, the participating teachers will implement the DBI process with identified students. Each teacher will gather and log data on

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

both a daily and weekly basis. The teachers will then have the opportunity to share their findings and address strengths and challenges during the designated PLC. The continuous review and problem solving of student-level data are embedded throughout the process, placing emphasis on the need to make timely, data-driven instructional changes that will increase the student's reading performance.

By April, half of the DBI modules will have been presented to participating teachers in addition to other invitees. The DBI implementation modules developed by AIR will focus on the core competencies of DBI. A trained DBI instructor will present the modules via a web-based platform. Half of the PLC meetings will have taken place by the end of April. The PLC is used to reinforce information learned during the DBI module sessions and also provide an opportunity where the pilot teachers can support each other to gain and retain the skills they are learning and practicing together. The PLC will serve as a forum for review and allow the pilot teachers to discuss their successes and challenges of implementing DBI.

## Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation

The WDE SSIP team has had the opportunity to reach out to a variety of interested parties during regular stakeholder group meetings. These groups have provided feedback most notably in developing our new theory of action. The following groups have supported the SSIP team through stakeholder feedback:

- Wyoming Association of Special Educator Administrators (WASEA)
- Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD)
- Wyoming Early Intervention Council (WYEIC)
- Wyoming Department of Education- Division updates

WAPSD has been particularly vocal in providing feedback for the future of DBI implementation. The council was clear that they would like to see the DBI implementation project scale up to include other districts as well as the regional child development centers (CDC) that provide IDEA Section 619 services. As a result, the SSIP interagency team decided to include CDCs in the next two cohorts for DBI implementation.

The Wyoming Instructional Network <http://wyominginstructionalnetwork.com> (WINWEB) is relied on to provide updates and resources unique to DBI and MTSS. The website functions as the central organizational hub for both the DBI modules as well as the pilot teacher PLC. Through this site, the SSIP team schedules training sessions, disseminates information on DBI and MTSS, as well as other activities. It also documents all TA (Technical Assistance) and PD (Professional Development) provided by the Division of Individual Learning. In addition to the primary communication outlet for stakeholders, WINWEB operates as the vehicle for preparing and collecting the evaluation materials used to collect data for both the SSIP DBI implementation pilot and the initiatives funded under the SPDG.

To ensure stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation, the four pilot LEAs had the opportunity to participate in the SSIP team's decision-making process through phone meetings and webinars designed to provide guidance, address concerns or questions and aid in identifying potential implementation barriers. As a result of these meetings, LEAs and the SSIP team were able to determine the most appropriate pilot schools and participating teachers.

Going forward, the pilot teachers will be an invaluable stakeholder group. Next school year, the SSIP team plans to expand the DBI implementation project. These teachers will not only advise WDE as to how to better assist future cohort groups but will also have a secondary role as mentors for future cohorts of teachers.

## C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

### How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan

The WY SSIP Team created an updated Theory of Action (see WYSSIP TOA.pdf). The Theory of Action provides an overview of how each of the four coherent improvement strategies will lead to various short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes. The WY SSIP Detailed Evaluation Plan document (see WYSSIP Evaluation Plan.pdf) and the WY SSIP Detailed Evaluation Questions 2016-17 document (see WYSSIP Detailed Evaluation Questions.pdf) provide details on the data sources for the key measures used to assess the implementation and outcomes of each coherent improvement strategy. These documents also are for the WY SSIP Team and the pilot schools to use as a reference to when, where, and how evaluations are to be completed.

The first three Strands of Action (improvement strategies) have to do with providing various levels of technical assistance (TA). For each of these three coherent improvement strategies, a standard set of evaluation questions are to be answered. These questions are grouped into "Input," "Output," and "Outcomes" questions. They take the form of the following:

1. **Input Questions**
2. Were the inputs used sufficiently?
3. What amounts of resources were used?
4. **Output Questions**
5. Did each of the specified activities occur?
6. Who participated in the specified activities?
7. Did the targeted people participate in the activities?
8. Were the training activities delivered with fidelity?
9. Were participants satisfied with the activities?
10. **Outcome Questions**

### Short-Term

1. Did the participants acquire new knowledge, skills, and attitudes?

### Medium-Term

2. Did the participants implement new skills?
3. Did the participants implement new skills with fidelity?

### Long-Term

4. Did students increase their reading achievement?
5. Are students with disabilities being placed in the regular environment at a greater rate than before?



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The general evaluation measures which go across these three strands of action are:

1. Activity tracking. A website (WINWEB) tracks each SSIP-related training that is conducted by the WDE.
2. End-of-Training Evaluations. The WINWEB website has a training evaluation component. Training participants are given a unique URL for each training and complete the evaluation online. The system produces evaluation reports in real-time.
3. Participant Tracking. The WINWEB has a participant tracking component. This allows the WDE to know who participated in each training.

In addition, the Intensive TA action strand and the Targeted Intensive Strand employ these type of evaluation measures:

4. A “post-test” administered after each DBI module to determine if participants’ knowledge of the topic discussed in the module.
5. Forms that measure whether participants are implementing new skills.
6. Fidelity of Implementation Tools. These tools are used by an external observer or self-report to measure implementation of new skills.
7. DBI Logs (for Intensive TA action strand only). These logs measure very detailed information regarding the interventions the pilot teachers are administering to the targeted students and the students’ progress.

These measures will allow the WY SSIP Team to assess progress toward achievement of the intended improvements. The WINWEB site allows for the tracking of the trainings and the training evaluations in real-time. The DBI Module Post-Tests, DBI Implementation Checklist, and DBI logs will allow for a reliable and useful check on the implementation and success of the DBI process.

The coherent improvement strategies are being implemented in four pilot schools. The four pilot schools are from four of the largest districts in the state. These four districts represent the western, eastern, and central part of the state. These four districts represent 27% of all students with disabilities in the state. And they represent 33% of all grade K-3 students placed in the resource room.

To measure the impact of the coherent improvement strategies on student outcomes, the SSIP Team will be using an interrupted time-series design with the comparison group.

- Data on student outcomes (state test data as well as formative school-based assessment) will be collected and analyzed at defined time periods before and after the intervention.
- Comparable schools and districts in the state will be identified to serve as a comparison group beginning in 2017-18.

The following data show the baseline data which was collected in 2013-14, and what has happened since then. Note that the DBI-related improvement activities started in 2016-17. Thus, improvement as a result of the DBI project will be collected for the first time in spring 2017. Note, however, that progress is being made on the SIMR goals already – prior to the DBI project implementation. We attribute this to at least in part, districts own individual efforts to improve grade 3 resource room student performance. Starting with 2013-14 data, each district has been given detailed information on the reading performance of K-3 students in the resource room and K-3 students in the general education environment on the MAP reading test and for grade 3 students, on the PAWS reading test. Display 1 illustrates the improvement toward achieving our SIMR goal. The display shows that Wyoming is making better than expected progress. (See Wyoming.SSIPPhaseIII.pdf for Displays 1-4)

### How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

The WDE will regularly review evaluation data as it becomes available. Data on outputs, short-term outcomes, and medium-term outcomes will be regularly reviewed. The first pieces of evaluation data from the pilot schools were collected in February 2017 and will be analyzed in April.

As data are just beginning to be collected, no changes have been made yet in the implementation and improvement strategies. However, a note on how the data will be reviewed is in order.

The data will be reviewed quarterly by the SSIP Core Team. The data will be reviewed with the pilot LEAs at the end of each school year to determine what worked well and what needs to change.

The WY SSIP Team will evaluate the initial effectiveness of the intensive, targeted, and universal TA through the WINWEB website. Because training evaluations are collected immediately after a training and because reports of results are created in real-time, satisfaction data can be analyzed right away. Post knowledge tests are collected at the end of each module training and this data is analyzed in timely fashion and provided to the DBI trainer prior to the next module training so that she may go over any misunderstandings with the PLC. In addition, the Observation Checklist for High Quality Professional Development will be used to assess the training to ensure that training includes the necessary components for it to be effective.

The WY SSIP Team will be collecting and reviewing data on a regular basis. The WY SSIP Team will meet monthly. Data on training activities are collected in real-time, and short-term data (e.g., progress monitoring data, implementation data, knowledge data) will be collected continually through-out the process. Thus, the WY SSIP Team will know very quickly if anything (activities, evaluations, communications, etc.) needs to be modified.

Data will be used to inform next steps in SSIP implementation. A thorough review of the evaluation data collected from the pilot schools in spring 2017 will be conducted in summer 2017.

### Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation.

In-person stakeholder meetings were held October 31<sup>st</sup> and November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016. At the fall meeting, detailed statistical information on how students in grades K-5 placed in the resource room performed on the state test and MAP test was provided. Characteristics of resource room students and their services were also reviewed.

The pilot districts will regularly get reports on the evaluations they complete so that they may make adjustments as necessary in the implementation of their plan. Frequent and transparent communication will be the norm. The evaluation process and results will be shared and discussed via five methods:

1. The WY SSIP Team will have meetings with the four pilot districts three times a year.
2. Email and phone will be used to frequently communicate with the four pilot districts in-between meetings. An “open door” policy will be followed.
3. The WY SSIP Team will provide annual updates to WAPSD on the SSIP evaluation and seek input from the advisory panel members.
4. During the monthly director phone call, local special education directors will be informed of the SSIP evaluation, on an annual basis, and be given a chance to provide input.
5. All local special education directors will have the opportunity to provide input at quarterly association meetings through the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA)

## D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

### Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR due to quality of the evaluation data.

As we are just beginning to collect evaluation information, we do not have any concerns at this time. In summer 2017, we will conduct a thorough analysis and reporting of all evaluation information collected; this analysis will include an assessment of the reliability and validity of the collected information. We will make any necessary changes in the evaluation measures at that time.

## E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

### Assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements

The WDE recognized a need to re-instate an internal WY SSIP Team. This team now has the directive to ensure SSIP activities are conducted in order to achieve the SiMR. The team now has the responsibility to provide the PD and TA necessary to the pilot cohort of teachers, as well as to support future cohorts as DBI implementation is scaled up throughout the state. WDE also, continues to build state wide infrastructure to support DBI implementation as it leverages the teachers who gain experience through the pilot to be used as coaches for future cohort participants.

In order to measure the continued effectiveness of SSIP activities, several evaluation measures will address the issue of fidelity of implementation. The DBI Implementation Checklist which will be completed by the DBI trainer at the beginning and ending of the module training will provide a detailed, expert view of the fidelity of implementation. The DBI Log, which is completed by the pilot teachers each week on each targeted student provides detailed fidelity of implementation data.

Initial analyses of the fidelity tool shows that across the four schools, and prior to any training, 54% of the dimensions of DBI are being implemented with fidelity. The dimensions with the highest scores are:

- School Schedules (92% fidelity score)
- Progress Monitoring Procedures (79%)
- Resources (75%)
- Diagnostic Assessment (75%)
- Regular Meetings (75%)

The dimensions with the lowest scores:

- Decision Rules (25% fidelity score)
- DBI Evaluation (25%)
- Overall Implementation of DBI Process (38%)

Initial analyses of the DBI logs show that most interventions are between 30-45 minutes five days a week. Most intervention plans and data collection plans are implemented as intended; students are engaged at least partially most of the time. Additional details about the data collected so far are provided in the WYSSIPDetailedEvaluationsQuestions.pdf.

As mentioned previously, we will have a meeting in summer 2017 to assess the progress towards the SiMR outcomes and targets.

## F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

May 2017 will mark the end of WDE's first cohort of DBI implementation in four pilot schools. The WDE will analyze evaluation data during the summer. The WY SSIP Team and stakeholders will determine changes and next steps before implementing the 2017-2018 cohort.

In September 2017, the WDE will roll-out the 2017-2018 cohort of DBI implementers. The WDE will expand participation within the designated pilot sites. First-year cohort teachers will each mentor an additional special education teacher through a train-the-trainer model. In addition to broadening the cadre of DBI implementers in four pilot sites, WDE will solicit other districts interested in pursuing DBI professional development. Expanding into other districts will be supported by our designated MTSS state and district coaches. 2017-2018 cohort participants will complete the following activities:

- Series of DBI professional development modules
- DBI PLC- second cohort to include new teachers and LEAs
- Annual leadership conference presentations and data share-outs
- Universal PD/TA around Best Practices in Literacy using PD platform

The SSIP evaluation plan for 2017-2018 cohort will replicate the current DBI evaluation plan, with increased data in the following areas:

- Increased number of students
- Increased number of teachers trained in the DBI process
- Additional collection of student-level data
- Ongoing verification of implementation Fidelity
- Other measures will be reported as the coaching models are implemented during the 2017-2018 cohort. The following evaluation measures will be considered:
- Effectiveness of Coaching
- Correlation data of the MTSS Fidelity of Implementation Checklist -and the DBI Fidelity of Implementation Rubric
- Relationship between DBI daily or weekly data points and mastery of IEP goals

During the first cohort, the SSIP team and stakeholders identified third-grade students coded in the Resource Room (RR). At the initial onsite DBI training, the team also identified students who may potentially be coded as RR in the third grade. The pilot teachers are working with students in grades two and three coded as either RR or RE.

Districts implementing DBI in early grades, may have a decline in the number of students who are coded as Resource Room. This is due to the timely response that takes place during the DBI data collection and implementation of targeted skills at the individual level. As a result students prior to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade could potentially be on track to perform proficient on the state test, therefore not receiving service in the Resource Room. In addition to attempting to lessen the use of RR in future third-grade students, the inclusion of students from multiple grades and environmental codes is intended to build the capacity of teachers, schools, and districts to

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

support a DBI approach.

Historically, turnover at the SEA (State Education Agency) has been a barrier to implementing the SSIP. WDE will complete the following activities to overcome the turnover challenge:

- Develop a cadre of trainers across the state located within their LEA
- Obtain commitment from future cohort teachers and coaches to participate for two or more years
- Create a consistent SEA SSIP team through building the requirement into established job duties
- Continue to seek support from Technical Assistance Centers such as National Center of Intensive Instruction.

WDE has determined that PAWS will no longer be used starting in the 2017-2018 school year. This will be another barrier that the WY SSIP team will have to work through. The team will have the same source of data for reporting next year. This will provide the team some time to develop a course of action to overcome the barrier of the assessment change.

The WDE will continue to seek support from Technical Assistance centers such as National Center of Intensive Instruction. The WDE currently has a contract with the American Institute for Research (AIR) to deliver DBI training and other relevant MTSS professional development. The department has identified the SSIP activity, DBI as a proposed professional development activity in the new SPDG proposal/grant.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**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: Anne-Marie Williams

Title: Director of Individual Learning

Email: anne-marie.williams@wyo.gov

Phone: 307-777-2870