

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

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

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE): Special Education Programs (SEP) implements a general supervision system that aligns with both the letter and spirit of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The WDE has worked to develop and implement an State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) process that is not only a means of for reporting to OSEP and the public on statewide data for students with disabilities, but is also an essential part of a holistic system of general supervision. The Wyoming General Supervision System is one that is integrated, robust, and responsive to data represented in the SPP/APR OSEP indicators. Ultimately, the SPP /APR process plays a key role in continuously improving educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

49

General Supervision System

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

In WDE's General Supervision System utilizes each of the eight essential components set forth by OSEP and the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM):

- State Performance Plan
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Fiscal Management
- Data on processes and results
- Improvement Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions
- Effective Dispute Resolution

Each of the 8 components is essential to an effective General Supervision System if students, parents, educators, key decision-makers, and other stakeholders are to have a comprehensive and accurate picture of what is truly happening for students with disabilities at the state and local levels. Data from each component are disaggregated and analyzed for the sole purpose of improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. Decisions made about activities within each component of general supervision are data-driven, and the effectiveness of those activities is assessed in relation to the improvement or decline in indicator and performance data.

In the fall of each year, the WDE conducts a one-day, in-depth analysis of statewide special education data, known as the "data drilldown." This statewide data analysis, which is mandatory for all Special Education Programs staff, is considered the foremost activity in Wyoming's General Supervision System. Attendees, including WDE staff from other divisions and external consultants, review the most recent statewide data related to the performance of students with disabilities across each of the SPP indicators. The team reviews data related to identification rates, special education and related services, the provision of assistive technology, extended school year enrollment, attendance, disciplinary incidents, English Language Learners (ELL), poverty, homelessness, and more. Data are disaggregated by a number of variables including disability category, environment, performance on the statewide assessment, grade level, age, gender, race and ethnicity.

The WDE's on-site focused monitoring system applies these data to a district selection formula comprised of key SPP indicators that emphasize student outcomes and educational results. Data are used to assess the effectiveness of the prior year's efforts, and develop or modify general supervision activities accordingly. The WDE uses data to effectually allocate resources and operate efficiently in a largely rural environment.

Wyoming's general supervision monitoring system includes the following components:

1. Stable Assessment (District Self-Assessment)
2. Risk-based Assessment
3. On-site focused monitoring.

Many IDEA program requirements are closely related to student outcomes and other requirements, while still important, are not as closely related to outcomes. By implementing the three components listed above, the WDE carefully monitors districts for compliance with both types of requirements. All Wyoming districts participate in the General Supervision System's Stable Assessment component on an annual basis. The Stable Assessment includes a review conducted by district staff (self-assessment), and several activities conducted by WDE monitoring teams (i.e. Indicators 8, 13, and 14). The self-assessment portion of the Stable Assessment includes a measure of procedural compliance with several key federal and state requirements. The WDE uses a checklist that measures program compliance, applied to a sample of twenty student files (or fewer if the district has fewer than 20 students). Each district is expected to achieve and maintain 100% compliance on the self-assessment.

Through completion of a set of activities known as the Risk-Based Assessment the WDE conducts additional monitoring activities in select districts based on district performance on indicators: 3B, 5C, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Districts are required to participate in the Risk-Based Assessment when their data fall outside of a defined range for those indicators. Participating districts are asked to explain the circumstances responsible for lower-than-expected performance and, depending upon the district's response, may be asked for additional information or may be required to implement corrective action.

On-site focused monitoring activities are structured around key SPP indicators that emphasize academic achievement and student outcomes. A selection formula is developed based upon those key indicators and statewide areas of concern identified through the annual data drilldown. A total score for each district is calculated using this formula. Districts with the lowest scores are selected for on-site monitoring visits based upon 4 different cohort sizes, focusing resources on those districts whose data indicate the greatest need and likelihood for improvement.

Prior to an on-site monitoring visit, the WDE analyzes district-level data to determine areas of potential noncompliance that might account for substandard performance outcomes. Hypotheses are developed related to the identified areas of potential noncompliance, and become the framework for on-site monitoring activities. Representative samples of student files are selected purposefully, and files are reviewed using tools designed to ensure regulatory compliance specific to the hypothesized area. Files that contain no evidence of noncompliance are removed from the sample. Files that appear to indicate potential noncompliance remain in the sample for further evaluation. The team may conduct interviews of district staff, parents or students or request additional documentation.

If there are findings of noncompliance, a report is written, detailing those findings. Some findings may be individualized, whereas others are found to be systemic. All findings of noncompliance must be corrected within one year, however, only systemic findings warrant a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). A CAP is a set of activities the LEA and WDE agree to undertake in order to address systemic district practices which resulted in findings of noncompliance and ensure correction within one year. 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 for the LEA.

The WDE utilizes a determinations formula which includes both compliance and performance indicators. Determinations are issued annually to LEAs. High quality technical assistance activities and resources are made available for districts that need assistance, need intervention or need substantial intervention.

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.

Because of Wyoming's rural nature, 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 eight components are designed to affect improvement in critical student outcome data. To structure these activities, WDE identifies broad improvement strategies which can be leveraged to affect these changes. Based upon 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 LEAs, but also provides the structure for the data-based analysis of the effectiveness of current activities.

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 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and on other areas of concern identified during that data analysis.

The improvement strategies 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 statewide areas of data-based concern arise, guidance documents are developed and disseminated to provide an ongoing resource to which educational agencies can refer. Statewide initiatives are implemented to support LEAs in making systemic changes to support the improvement of student outcomes. These initiatives include web-based presentations and resources. Currently the State is supporting Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS), Preschool to Kindergarten Transition, and Data-based Individualization (DBI) initiatives.

Access to resources and web-based training is provided through the WDE's Wyoming Instructional Network website (WINWEB) and WDE holds monthly Zoom presentations for all directors in the form of a Director's Academy. The topics are chosen from specific areas of need identified through the annual data drill down activity and trends identified through state complaints.

When noncompliance with procedural or outcomes-based components of IDEA or state law are identified based on annual determinations, monitoring, or complaint findings, the WDE may develop technical assistance training to address the specific needs of the LEAs. 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.

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.

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 are identified and 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 targeted professional development and technical assistance. Following the annual data drilldown activity, these strategies are reviewed and, based on the areas of concern identified during that data analysis, the specific improvement activities for the year are identified.

As with 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 (Wyoming's Academic Vision for Excellence [WAVE] annual conference), collaboration with other adjacent states to maximize resources to address like areas of need, provision of session presentations or content on compliance and performance-based topics during statewide or regional professional development activities coordinated by other WDE divisions, state agencies or private entities, and the development of web-based training opportunities to allow easier access to information and training and mitigate some of the challenges that the large size and rural nature of the state create.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The Special Education Programs Division posts a current SPP online and notifies 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.

<https://wyominginstructionalnetwork.com/spp-apr/>

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 targets in the SPP. The WDE creates annual reports for each LEA. The reports are issued to each educational agency and posted on the WDE website:

<https://edu.wyoming.gov/in-the-classroom/special-programs/>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 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 in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including 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; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 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 in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	50.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	59.00%	61.81%	59.08%	64.50%	61.08%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	64.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	597
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	952
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	62.71%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
597	952	61.08%	85.00%	62.71%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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)]
- 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? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	12.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	6.25%	6.20%	6.15%	6.10%	6.05%
Data	6.08%	5.56%	5.39%	5.44%	6.21%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	6.00%	6.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	430
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	47
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	3
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	183
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	4

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? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
205	3,326	6.21%	6.00%	6.16%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Elementary	98.80%	Actual	99.55%	99.05%	99.34%	99.35%	99.25%
B	Middle	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Middle	97.80%	Actual	99.12%	98.86%	98.70%	99.09%	98.28%
C	HS	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	HS	95.50%	Actual	89.59%	89.42%	94.67%	93.28%	97.04%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Elementary	98.70%	Actual	99.48%	99.08%	99.24%	99.35%	99.20%
B	Middle	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Middle	97.90%	Actual	99.12%	98.81%	98.70%	97.92%	98.08%
C	HS	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	HS	95.20%	Actual	89.59%	89.55%	94.67%	93.28%	97.04%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Middle	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	HS	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Elementary	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Middle	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	HS	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,135	1,177	1,102	1,054	957	974	958	747			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	577	581	406	549	373	493	441	398			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	482	525	606	417	503	376	415	283			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	66	63	83	81	67	84	68	57			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,135	1,177	1,102	1,054	957	974	958	747			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	720	668	611	623	479	523	631	512			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	339	436	403	343	398	345	238	166			

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	66	63	83	81	67	84	68	57			

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	4,468	4,436	99.25%	95.00%	99.28%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Middle	1,931	1,896	98.28%	95.00%	98.19%	Met Target	No Slippage
C	HS	1,705	1,662	97.04%	95.00%	97.48%	Met Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	4,468	4,436	99.20%	95.00%	99.28%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	Middle	1,931	1,896	98.08%	95.00%	98.19%	Met Target	No Slippage
C	HS	1,705	1,672	97.04%	95.00%	98.06%	Met Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

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/pawsresultsstateleveldisaggregated>

District-level results are here:

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Elementary	23.69%	Actual	28.03%	26.35%	26.87%	26.48%	23.69%
B	Middle	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	Middle	20.12%	Actual	21.69%	18.88%	18.73%	18.48%	20.12%
C	HS	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
C	HS	14.68%	Actual	16.33%	10.68%	14.69%	14.41%	14.68%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Elementary	22.87%	Actual	25.85%	24.37%	26.35%	25.58%	22.87%
B	Middle	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	Middle	14.96%	Actual	17.20%	14.80%	15.26%	15.91%	14.96%
C	HS	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
C	HS	11.82%	Actual	14.14%	10.95%	15.00%	10.66%	11.82%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary	100.00%	24.00%
Reading	B >=	Middle	100.00%	20.41%
Reading	C >=	HS	100.00%	16.52%
Math	A >=	Elementary	100.00%	23.77%
Math	B >=	Middle	100.00%	18.09%
Math	C >=	HS	100.00%	11.99%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

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	1,125	1,169	1,095	1,047	943	953	924	738			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	213	148	114	132	80	113	61	71			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	50	70	49	51	51	38	29	28			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	35	32	44	49	40	46	36	33			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

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	1,125	1,167	1,097	1,047	944	952	937	735			

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	249	183	154	104	90	88	42	46			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	34	51	53	35	29	41	16	11			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	36	28	41	42	34	42	30	22			

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	4,436	987	23.69%	100.00%	22.25%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B	Middle	1,896	368	20.12%	100.00%	19.41%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	HS	1,662	258	14.68%	100.00%	15.52%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary	<p>The WDE has examined the proficiency rates of grades 3-6 students by district to identify those districts that had a decrease from 2017-18 to 2018-19. One-half (24) of 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 2019, the WDE conducted 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. Even though the decrease in proficiency from FFY2017 to FFY2018 is not a statistically significant difference, WDE did some additional examination of the data. Students with disabilities who took the Alternate Assessment had a greater decrease in their proficiency rate than students with disabilities who took the regular assessment. In fact, if students who took the Alternate Assessment scored at the same proficiency in spring 2019 as in spring 2018, there would be no slippage in the overall score whatsoever. The reason for the slippage is there was a new Alternate Assessment in spring 2019. The new Alternate Assessment impacted scores because of the new methodology; it went from a fixed paper form to an online version, the computer instead of the teacher read the items, and there were speech-to-text issues. In addition, the accommodations for paper-and-pencil did not translate well to computerized testing. These are growing pains for moving to an online system. As a result of these issues, the WDE has modified the accommodations section on the model IEP forms so that IEP teams can identify the exact accommodation that a student needs. The WDE has provided statewide training to all Alternate Assessment directors and has provided targeted training to districts on request. To help ensure that students are getting the needed accommodations, during test security visits, the WDE checks that what is on the IEP is what is being provided on the testing platform.</p> <p>Even though slippage can be entirely explained as to the slippage in the Alternate Assessment scores, the WDE also examined changes in the regular assessment. Students with disabilities in grade 5 had the largest decrease of grades 3 to 6, and within grade 5, students with Other Health Impairments had the largest decrease. WDE has followed up with districts to find out why this student group, as well as other student groups, had a decrease in proficiency. Districts mentioned that there were text-to-speech issues on the WY-TOPP that had an impact on scores. The WDE has directed the vendor to address the text-to-speech issues on both the WY-TOPP and the WY-ALT. WDE will track the results of this change the next time the assessments are given which will be spring 2021.</p>

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
		At the regional data share-outs in fall 2020, WDE will be providing structured time for districts to analyze their proficiency data in-depth and to conduct root cause analyses about decreases (as well as any improvements). WDE will collect this information from districts for enhanced understanding of proficiency decreases as well as to determine statewide PD/TA needs. Furthermore, staff from the child development center preschools will be joining the regional data share-outs this year for the first time so that preschool and district staff can discuss how the two separate educational systems of preschool and grade K-3 can work together in order to increase student achievement/outcomes in the early grades.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary	4,436	1,010	22.87%	100.00%	22.77%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Middle	1,896	324	14.96%	100.00%	17.09%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	HS	1,672	167	11.82%	100.00%	9.99%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	HS	<p>The WDE has examined the proficiency rates of grades 9-10 students by district to identify those districts that had a decrease from 2017-18 to 2018-19. One-half (24) of 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 2019, the WDE conducted 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. Even though the decrease in proficiency from FFY2017 to FFY2018 is not a statistically significant difference, WDE did some additional examination of the data. Students with disabilities who took the Alternate Assessment had a greater decrease in their proficiency rate than students with disabilities who took the regular assessment. In fact, if students who took the Alternate Assessment scored at the same proficiency in spring 2019 as in spring 2018, the amount of slippage would be cut by more than half. Thus, the main reason for this slippage is there was a new Alternate Assessment in spring 2019 that had different standards and was more stringent than the prior Alternate Assessment. The new Alternate Assessment impacted scores because of the new methodology; it went from a fixed paper form to an online version, the computer instead of the teacher read the items, and there were speech to text issues. In addition, the accommodations for paper-and-pencil did not translate well to computerized testing. These are growing pains for moving to an online system. As a result of these issues, the WDE has modified the accommodations section on the model IEP forms so that IEP teams can identify the exact accommodation that a student needs. The WDE has provided statewide training to all Alternate Assessment directors and has provided targeted training to districts on request. To help ensure that students are getting the needed accommodations, during test security visits, the WDE checks that what is on the IEP is what is being provided on the testing platform.</p> <p>In addition to the Alternate Assessment, WDE examined changes in the regular assessment. Given that the regular assessment was administered to grade 9 and 10 students for the second time in spring 2019 (prior to this, students in grade 11 took the statewide assessment), it is no surprise that proficiency rates decreased because schools and districts are still working on their curriculum, instruction, and scheduling to make sure it is completely aligned with the grade 9 and 10 State Standards and assessment. Additional disaggregation of the data showed that students with disabilities in grade 10 had the largest decrease of grades 9 and 10, and within grade 10 students with Specific Learning Disabilities had the largest decrease. WDE has followed up with districts to find out why this student group as well as other groups had a decrease in proficiency. Districts indicated that the reasons for the decrease in high school math proficiency had to do with the increased rigor of the WY-TOPP and a lag in aligning the curriculum to the WY-TOPP. The districts are working hard to align their curriculum, courses, and interventions to the more rigorous standards of the WY-TOPP.</p> <p>At the regional data share-outs in fall 2020, WDE will be providing structured time for districts to analyze their proficiency data in-depth and to conduct root cause analyses about decreases (as well as any improvements). WDE will collect this information from districts for enhanced understanding of proficiency decreases as well as to determine statewide PD/TA needs.</p>

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in

those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

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 URLs. State-Level Results:

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

District-Level Results:

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

School-Level Results:

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline year is FFY 2017 due to the statewide test changing in spring 2018. The test is now the Wyoming Test of Proficiency and Progress (WY-TOPP). The new state consists of standards-based summative assessments that extend continuously from grade 3 through grade 10. This is in contrast to the previous system where assessments were tied to one set of standards in grades 3-8 (Wyoming State Content Standards) but to a different set of content standards in high school (ACT).

Regarding OSEP's comment about the targets: Prior to the Feb. 2020 submission, the WDE changed the baseline data to FFY 2017 and changed the baseline scores to reflect the 2017 scores. At some point, these scores reverted back to the original baseline proficiency rates (we don't know if this was a problem with the EMAPS system or what). The baseline year still said 2017. During the April 2020 clarification period, the WDE changed the baseline scores once again to the actual FFY 2017 proficiency rates. So now, the FFY 2019 targets are higher than the baseline data.

Regarding OSEP's comment about slippage, we have added additional information to the slippage boxes above.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	46	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The WDE uses the "state bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2018 state rate (based on 2017-18 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.30%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.30% 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 2018 for Indicator 4A. In the entire state of Wyoming, only 47 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2018. Only 13 LEAs had a suspension rate greater than 0%, and none had a suspension rate greater than 5.30%. 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.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 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 State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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.

4

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	45	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The WDE uses the "state bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2018 state rate (based on 2017-18 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.30%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.30% 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 2018 for Indicator 4B. In the entire state of Wyoming, only 47 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2018. 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 2018 for Indicator 4B. Only 13 LEAs had a suspension rate greater than 0%. Of these 13 LEAs, one was excluded for a given race/ethnicity rate because there was not at least 25 students in the denominator (for this LEA, only 1 of 3 students were 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, 45 had at least one ratio calculated for Indicator 4B that was based on at least 25 students.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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 State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	61.84%	62.09%	62.34%	62.59%	62.84%
A	54.30%	Data	61.84%	65.21%	65.38%	66.86%	68.59%
B	2005	Target <=	7.25%	7.10%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
B	9.15%	Data	7.09%	6.66%	6.49%	6.10%	6.23%
C	2005	Target <=	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%
C	2.63%	Data	1.34%	2.02%	2.00%	1.81%	1.80%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	63.09%	65.09%
Target B <=	6.75%	6.50%
Target C <=	1.33%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	12,348

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,731
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	712
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	79
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	117
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	23

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,731	12,348	68.59%	63.09%	70.71%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	712	12,348	6.23%	6.75%	5.77%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	219	12,348	1.80%	1.33%	1.77%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	61.48%	61.73%	61.98%	62.23%	62.48%
A	59.84%	Data	61.48%	56.22%	65.19%	59.90%	69.26%
B	2011	Target <=	29.01%	28.76%	28.51%	28.26%	28.01%
B	30.80%	Data	29.01%	33.89%	25.25%	30.85%	23.95%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	62.73%	67.50%
Target B <=	27.76%	22.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,139

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,387
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	200
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	372
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,387	3,139	69.26%	62.73%	76.04%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	573	3,139	23.95%	27.76%	18.25%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	87.50%	87.50%	87.60%	87.70%	87.90%
A1	60.68%	Data	87.50%	91.23%	90.76%	88.33%	87.79%

A2	2008	Target >=	57.13%	57.13%	57.33%	57.53%	57.53%
A2	56.87%	Data	57.13%	59.40%	59.49%	59.25%	76.05%
B1	2008	Target >=	89.27%	89.27%	89.37%	89.47%	89.67%
B1	61.12%	Data	89.27%	92.06%	92.57%	84.71%	70.34%
B2	2008	Target >=	53.72%	53.72%	53.82%	53.92%	54.12%
B2	54.77%	Data	53.72%	58.07%	61.60%	54.87%	54.53%
C1	2008	Target >=	89.18%	89.18%	89.28%	89.38%	89.58%
C1	63.81%	Data	89.18%	92.77%	91.56%	86.30%	78.50%
C2	2008	Target >=	68.55%	68.55%	68.65%	68.75%	68.95%
C2	67.05%	Data	68.55%	77.79%	74.89%	70.84%	72.47%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	89.50%	79.00%
Target A2 >=	59.13%	75.00%
Target B1 >=	91.27%	61.15%
Target B2 >=	55.72%	57.50%
Target C1 >=	91.18%	64.00%
Target C2 >=	70.55%	70.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,053

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	54	5.13%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	89	8.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	50	4.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	481	45.68%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	379	35.99%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the	531	674	87.79%	89.50%	78.78%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	860	1,053	76.05%	59.13%	81.67%	Met Target	No Slippage

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	150	14.25%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	185	17.57%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	115	10.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	372	35.33%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	231	21.94%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	487	822	70.34%	91.27%	59.25%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	603	1,053	54.53%	55.72%	57.26%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	86	8.17%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	162	15.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	68	6.46%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	324	30.77%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	413	39.22%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.	392	640	78.50%	91.18%	61.25%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	737	1,053	72.47%	70.55%	69.99%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	To determine why there is slippage in A1, the WDE examined results by the 14 regions to determine if this slippage was present in all 14 preschool regions or if it was particular to just certain regions. Data indicated that 13 of the 14 regions saw a decrease in their A1 score. The primary reason for the decrease is the change in methodology for collecting data for Indicator 7 (see below). The entry scores for the majority of students were collected via the previous scoring method. Once the new data collection method is fully implemented at entry and exit, the EIEP and the WDE will set appropriate targets for A1 (and other outcome areas). Each region is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregations of the scores by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, services, etc. so that they can begin to determine which students improve/exit at age level and which do not.
B1	To determine why there is slippage in B1, the WDE examined results by the 14 regions to determine if this slippage was present in all 14 preschool regions or if it was particular to just certain regions. Data indicated that 11 of the 14 regions saw a decrease in their B1 score. The primary reason for the decrease is the change in methodology for collecting data for Indicator 7 (see below). The entry scores for the majority of students were collected via the previous scoring method. Once the new data collection method is fully implemented at entry and exit, the EIEP and the WDE will set appropriate targets for B1 (and other outcome areas). Each region is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregations of the scores by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, services, etc. so that they can begin to determine which students improve/exit at age level and which do not.
C1	To determine why there is slippage in C1, the WDE examined results by the 14 regions to determine if this slippage was present in all 14 preschool regions or if it was particular to just certain regions. Data indicated that 12 of the 14 regions saw a decrease in their C1 score. The primary reason for the decrease is the change in methodology for collecting data for Indicator 7 (see below). The entry scores for the majority of students were collected via the previous scoring method. Once the new data collection method is fully implemented at entry and exit, the EIEP and the WDE will set appropriate targets for C1 (and other outcome areas). Each region is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregations of the scores by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, services, etc. so that they can begin to determine which students improve/exit at age level and which do not.
C2	To determine why there is slippage in C2, the WDE examined results by the 14 regions to determine if this slippage was present in all 14 preschool regions or if it was particular to just certain regions. Data indicated that 9 of the 14 regions saw a decrease in their C2 score. The primary reason for the decrease is the change in methodology for collecting data for Indicator 7 (see below). The entry scores for the majority of students were collected via the previous scoring method. Once the new data collection method is fully implemented at entry and exit, the EIEP and the WDE will set appropriate targets for C2 (and other outcome areas). Each region is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregations of the scores by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, services, etc. so that they can begin to determine which students improve/exit at age level and which do not.

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/no)

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

In 2018-19, all preschool regions had transitioned to the new process for gathering data on the three outcomes areas. All regions use 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.

Note that there are still some students who, upon entry, used the previous process for gathering data on the three outcomes areas. Under the previous process, the regions could use one or more of the following assessments to collect data:

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

With the previous process, the IEP team would also review 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.

Starting in 2016-17, the new process, based solely on the BDI was implemented with a select group of regions. The purpose of the new process is to standardize the process for collecting information and to ensure the data are reliable and valid. As of 2018-19, all regions were using the BDI-based process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	51.28%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	74.61%	74.89%	75.14%	75.39%	75.64%
Data	74.61%	75.47%	80.22%	78.56%	82.11%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	75.89%	78.50%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,271	1,524	82.11%	75.89%	83.40%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

5,022

Percentage of respondent parents

30.35%

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/age levels respond to the survey.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If 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 49 LEAs. 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.

In addition to the sampling plan, WDE allowed districts to distribute the survey to additional parents of students with disabilities as a way to increase the total number of parent respondents. WDE analyzed the data by methodology (WDE-administered vs. District-administered) and noted no significant differences in the two when the proper weighting is applied. Thus, WDE is assured that the indicator 8 results are valid and reliable.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	WY Parent Survey Spring 2019 K-12_508 compliant
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.

The representativeness of the survey 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 generally representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the grade level of the child; and (3) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 23% of the PreK-12 parents who returned a survey indicated that their children's primary disability is Specific Learning Disability, and 24% of PreK-12 students with disabilities in the sample have a Specific Learning Disability. However, results showed that parents of white students were more likely to respond than parents of non-white students. 82% of parent respondents indicated that their student is white, and 75% of students with disabilities in the sample are white. The WDE will continue to encourage districts to encourage their parents of all race/ethnicities to respond to the survey. Parents from each district and region responded to the survey.

Although the data indicated that parents of non-white students were slightly less likely to respond than parents of white students, the data also indicated no significant differences in survey responses by race/ethnicity, so we are confident that the results are representative. Further, statewide results were weighted by district/preschool region to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents and thus, were in fact, representative of the state.

Even though results are representative, WDE wants to increase the response rate of all parents, but particularly parents of non-white students. Some activities that WDE is doing in 2019-20 are the following.

As mentioned previously, in 2018-19, WDE allowed districts to distribute the survey to additional parents of students with disabilities as a way to increase the total number of parent respondents. Districts were allowed to use different methods of administration (e.g., in-person, text blasts, email blasts). The sampling plan is still followed for each district; these surveys are over-and-above the WDE sample. The WDE weights all results appropriately.

- WDE will analyze these district-distributed methods by race/ethnicity to see what differences in response rate and parent involvement percentages there are.
- WDE will follow-up with districts to see if there are particularly effective communication and dissemination strategies they are using for their parents, but particularly for parents of non-white students with disabilities.
- WDE will ask districts for actions that WDE and/or districts could take to increase the response rate of parents of non-white students with disabilities.

Districts will receive reports on results by survey distribution method and by race/ethnicity and be encouraged to analyze their data and make action plans.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Regarding OSEP's comment about the representativeness of the survey results: The WDE added information to the box above asking about the representativeness of the survey results.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	48	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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.

Please note that Wyoming has 48 K-12 districts, and 1 preschool district. The preschool district serves children age 3 to 5; as such Indicators 9 and 10 are irrelevant to this preschool district. Thus, the correct denominator is 48 and the correct number of exclusions for not meeting the minimum n size is 0. (The preschool district wasn’t excluded because it didn’t meet the minimum n – it was excluded because it doesn’t serve children age 6 and up.)

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 Results Driven Accountability 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	43	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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 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 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 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.

Please note that Wyoming has 48 K-12 districts, and 1 preschool district. The preschool district serves children age 3 to 5; as such Indicators 9 and 10 are irrelevant to this preschool district. Thus, the correct denominator is 48 and the correct number of exclusions for not meeting the minimum n size is 0. (The preschool district wasn't excluded because it didn't meet the minimum n – it was excluded because it doesn't serve children age 6 and up.)

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 Results Driven Accountability 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
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.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	95.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.22%	98.57%	98.68%	98.34%	98.55%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,077	4,013	98.55%	100%	98.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

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

Of the 4,077 initial evaluations under Part B conducted during FFY 2018, there were 64 that did not meet the 60-day timeline requirement. Of these 64, 20 were from the State's 48 public school districts, and 44 were from the State's developmental preschools. The range in days beyond the 60-day timeline was 1 to 79 days. Reasons for the delay: delays in evaluations, parental cancellations of meetings; difficulty contacting parents; 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

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

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
57	57		0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Regarding the 57 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 60 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 60 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 2018-19 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 2017 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 FFY2017 (the 57 evaluations) were timely corrected within the one-year time-frame. Each district with noncompliance in FFY2017 was (1) timely corrected within the one-year time-frame of notification and (2) is currently implementing the regulatory requirements of this indicator based on a review of updated data consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	68.29%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	91.64%	88.47%	94.38%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	528
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	122
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	371

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	371	403	94.38%	100%	92.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The WDE compared the FFY 2018 data to the FFY 2017 data to determine which regions had a decrease in timely eligibility determinations. Six of the fourteen regions had a decrease in their Indicator 12 scores. The WDE has provided information to these six regions (and the other eight) on their Indicator 12 scores. Further technical assistance will be provided to the LEAs to assist with compliance in this area.

In FFY17, there were 29 children for whom their Part B eligibility was not determined by their third birthday, and in FFY18 there were 32 children. The absolute difference in the two years is very small. In reaching out to individual regions, it was determined that one large region had altered its process in the 2018-2019 SY that resulted in fewer children being evaluated on time. It was their attempt to increase the comprehensiveness of the evaluations which resulted in a lengthier process that was a contributing factor for missing this timeline. This region has already revised its procedures to ensure improved compliance. This region had the largest slippage and the most negative impact on the State's I-12 data.

In addition to the above, the WDE also revised its review process when looking at the "explanations" for missed deadlines. The WDE now uses two reviewers who must come to a consensus to ensure that only those explanations that indicate a parent's repeated refusal to make the student available for an evaluation meet the federal exception to the evaluation timeline.

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
32

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 32 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 328. Reasons for the delays included parent request, sick child, difficulty contacting parent, and parent canceling meeting.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Regarding OSEP's comment about slippage: The WDE added information to the slippage box above.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
29	29		0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Regarding the 29 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 2018-19 school year.

Preschool regions found out of compliance 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 FFY2017 (the 29 evaluations) were timely corrected within the one-year time-frame. Each region with noncompliance in FFY2016 was (1) timely corrected within the one-year time-frame 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).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	54.58%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.22%	94.32%	87.29%	93.67%	98.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
390	393	98.50%	100%	99.24%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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 General Supervision/Monitoring 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.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6		0

FFY 2017 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 2018. The WDE's review of these students' documentation during the spring of 2019 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 2017 APR under Indicator 13, the WDE made 6 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 2018. The LEAs in question were required to submit Prior Written Notice forms and revised IEPs detailing the corrections made on each student's behalf.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment" in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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: States 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.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2013	Target >=	26.18%	26.43%	26.68%	26.93%	27.18%
A	26.18%	Data	26.18%	28.44%	29.55%	26.43%	22.47%
B	2013	Target >=	58.12%	58.37%	58.62%	58.87%	59.12%
B	58.12%	Data	58.12%	63.03%	55.40%	57.29%	58.10%
C	2013	Target >=	72.77%	73.27%	73.77%	74.27%	74.77%
C	72.77%	Data	72.77%	80.57%	71.31%	71.25%	74.09%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	27.43%	27.00%
Target B >=	59.37%	60.00%
Target C >=	75.75%	76.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

FFY 2018 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	448
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	113
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	180
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)	42

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).	19
--	----

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	113	448	22.47%	27.43%	25.22%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	293	448	58.10%	59.37%	65.40%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	354	448	74.09%	75.75%	79.02%	Met Target	No Slippage

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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The overall response rate (68%) is very high. Response rates by the demographic characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of exiter were analyzed to determine if one group was more likely to respond than another group. No significant differences existed in response rates by gender or ethnicity. Students with a speech/language impairment (32%) were significantly less likely to respond than students with Autism (73%), students with a specific learning disability (72%), and students with other health impairments (67%). Students who dropped out (54%) were significantly less likely to respond than students who graduated with a regular diploma (74%). The WDE will continue to work with districts to help them increase their response rates for all subgroups.

	Yes / 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)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	2
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%		0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	2	0.00%		50.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	3
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During this reporting period, presentations were given during the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA) Fall Conference, and Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) meeting. A review of Special Education data, both for the State and by LEA, 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 with disabilities. During these annual activities, LEAs 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. In addition to these activities the WAPSD, WASEA, districts administrators of all 49 LEAs, Parents Helping Parents, and the parent advocacy group Parent Information Center (PIC) was given the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on setting the new indicator targets in the SPP. The WDE was pleased with the level of participation and is responding to each comment in writing. With this collaboration, the WDE believes the new proposed targets are rigorous and attainable.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data	60.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	2	3	80.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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.

Select the certifier's role:

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:

Susan Shipley

Title:

Wyoming's Part B Data Manager

Email:

susan.shipley@wyo.gov

Phone:

3077772925

Submitted on:

04/30/20 3:45:20 PM