

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Wyoming**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

**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 a State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) process that is not only a means of 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.

### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

It is important to note that most of Wyoming's public schools and regional child development centers were open fully for in-person instruction during the 2020-2021 school year. While some individual indicators have been impacted by COVID, we have found no impact to data accuracy and timeliness.

### 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.

The 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).

Wyoming's General Supervision System includes the following components:

#### Stable Assessment

All Wyoming LEA's participate in the Stable Assessment component on an annual basis. The Stable Assessment includes a review conducted by LEA staff and several activities conducted by WDE monitoring teams. The self-assessment portion of the Stable Assessment includes a measure of procedural compliance with several key federal and state requirements and every LEA is expected to maintain 100% compliance with all of them. The Stable Assessment also includes focused reviews on the timeliness and accuracy of data reporting. The WDE tracks the timeliness of each LEA's submissions. Timeliness is judged by considering submission dates for the self-assessment results, the certification date for the WDE 684, 457, and 459 data collections.

The final component of the Stable Assessment is the annual Indicator 12 and 13 internal review. For Indicator 13 the WDE annually requests and reviews a sample of files for students of post-secondary transition-age. The WDE reviews these files according to the National Technical Assistance Center's Transition Checklist and if any non-compliance is found, the WDE responds in writing with specific guidance to assist the LEA in correcting the deficiencies and achieving compliance. LEAs must provide assurance of correction after taking the actions described in the State's letter, and send evidence documenting the fact that correction has taken place in the case of each student. Conversely, if the sample files are all in compliance with these requirements, the LEA special education director receives written notification that the files were found to be in full compliance. Following the initial transition file review, districts that failed to achieve 100% compliance during the first review must attend required training and submit an assurance of compliance. A secondary review is conducted which includes several new student files as well as several files that were out of compliance during the initial review. Even though these districts have provided assurance of correction after the initial review, the WDE verifies that the specific violations have been corrected. For Indicator 12, the Wyoming Department of Health, Behavioral Health Division (BHD- the LEA responsible for Part B ages 3-5) are provided with the WISER IDs of all students who did not meet the compliance indicator. The 619 Coordinator provides justifications for any students who did not meet the requirements. After review of justifications, for any student that the Child Development Center (CDC) did not meet the transition timeline, the WISER IDs of these students are referred back to BHD. This is to ensure corrective action is taken by BHD. The WDE confirms that BHD verified eligibility was determined for each student, reviewed local policies and procedures, reviewed subsequent student files transitioning from Part C to Part B to ensure complaint practices, and conducted training with regional staff if required. This is in keeping with OSEP guidance as described in the 09-02 Memo. Any failure to meet the timeline is considered a finding of noncompliance and the BHD is notified as such.

#### Risk-Based Assessment

Through a completion of a set of activities known as the Risk-Based Assessment (RBA), the WDE conducts additional monitoring activities in select LEAs based on LEA performance on select indicators: 3A (formally 3B), 4B, 5C, 9, 10, and 11. LEAs are required to participate in the RBA when the data falls outside of a defined range on any of the aforementioned indicators. In general, the RBA asks LEAs to explain the reasons behind lower-than expected performance on one or more of the aforementioned indicators. For example, for Indicator 3A, the LEA is asked to explain why certain students with disabilities in WY-TOPP test-taking grades reportedly did not participate in one or more assessment subtests. For Indicator 11, the LEA is asked to provide a justification behind its failure to meet the 60-day timeline for an initial evaluation. Depending on the LEA's response, the WDE may ask for additional information or require the LEA to implement activities designed to prevent future poor performance, require training for the LEA staff, review policies and procedures, and review subsequent student files to ensure complaint evaluation practices. Any failure to meet the 60-day timeline for an initial evaluation is considered a finding of non-compliance and LEAs are immediately notified as such. When a LEA's performance on Indicators 9 and/or 10 results in an Alternate Risk Ratio of >3.00 or <0.25, the WDE requests the files of students who comprise the group(s) flagged for possible inappropriate identification. WDE monitoring team members then review the evaluation procedures used in each student's case to determine if evaluations and eligibility determinations were made in accordance with IDEA requirements. LEAs who have found students eligible under incorrect evaluation procedures, or due to faulty eligibility determinations, are required to address the non-compliance immediately through a corrective action process.

#### On-site Monitoring

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. Focused indicators are selected and LEAs having the most negative impact on those indicators AND whose

determination status is anything other than meets requirements, are eligible to be selected for on-site monitoring. LEAs are divided into four population size categories and the lowest performing LEA in each category is selected for monitoring during that SY. Representative samples of student files are selected purposefully, and files are reviewed using tools designed to ensure regulatory compliance specific to the hypothesized area. On-site monitoring consists of 1. Pre-monitoring consultation, 2. Special Education file reviews, 3. Reviews of policies and procedures, 4. Interviews with staff. 5. Student observations, 6. Review of service provider logs, 7. Exit interview to explain findings, and 8. Monitoring report. If there are findings of noncompliance, a report is written, detailing those findings. Some findings may be individualized, whereas others may be found to be systemic. All systemic findings of noncompliance must be corrected within one year through a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). For individual student findings of noncompliance, we often give a 30 day correction period. 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 warrants a Compliance Agreement, which is more directive and provides more intensive and targeted support to the LEA.

Determinations Process: In accordance with Federal regulation and Chapter 7 Rules, each spring the WDE collects and reports data on performance and compliance indicators. Based on these data sets, the WDE places each LEA into one of four determination categories: Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, or Needs Substantial Intervention. There are differing levels of support and activities with each level.

#### Dispute Resolution

The WY system for resolving disputes include mediation, state complaints, and due process, as outlined and required by the IDEA.

#### 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.**

The WDE annually conducts two types of data events which analyze the compliance and outcome areas that need the most attention and guidance from the State. The first is a one-day statewide data drill down. Internally, and with the addition of a few key stakeholders, the Special Education Programs Division holds a data retreat in which all Indicator data is disaggregated and areas of improvement and slippage are identified. The group looks for trends and sets high, medium, and low areas of need/focus.

The second type of event is a regional data share out. This is a two week activity in which the state is divided into 4 geographical areas plus two additional areas for BHD and LEAs from each area come to meet with the WDE for an in-depth look at their individual entity's data. Each LEA has access to their data through various reports the WDE provides. Facilitators lead participants through the state's Structured Activity Data Guidebook on several different topic areas: Identification, Eligibility, Placement, Services, and Student Outcomes (aggregated and also disaggregated by subgroups such as race/ethnicity, grade, disability category, etc.). Participants identify their agency's successes and challenges and leave with an identified problem to focus on for the school year. The WDE keeps track of each LEA's area of need/focus and looks for trends across the state.

Through these two critical activities, along with keeping a database of technical assistance calls and emails the state received over the past year, WDE identifies broad improvement strategies which can be leveraged to affect change. 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.

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 and support the work of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These initiatives include web-based presentations and resources. Currently the State is supporting Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS), through an established state-level MTSS Center, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS), Preschool to Kindergarten Transition, and Data-Based Individualization (DBI) [a tier 3 intensive intervention structure] initiatives.

Access to resources and web-based training is provided through the WDE's Wyoming Instructional Network website (WIN WEB). Also, monthly Zoom calls were held for all special education directors through a Director's Academy. The topics are chosen from specific areas of need identified through the annual data drill down activities and trends identified through state complaints.

Other sources of data that inform the State's technical assistance needs are based on annual LEA determinations and monitoring. In addition, information is gathered from the outreach consultants who support students with visual impairments and students who are deaf or hard of hearing, as they are in schools and classrooms on a weekly basis. They provide student level technical assistance to educational agencies in support of improved evaluations, 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 children with disabilities.**

As with all areas of the WY General Supervision system, broad professional development improvement strategies are identified through a thorough analysis of special education data; both compliance and outcome data. Data informs the content, structure, and audience for professional development activities. For the reporting period, professional development improvement strategies continued the use of a restructured virtual format due, in part, to pandemic concerns, but also for more efficient and effective use of fiscal resources.

Professional Development (PD) has two approaches; Universal and Targeted. The Universal PD content is applicable to all in special education, regardless of the student population the professional works with or their role in the special education system.

Universal PD offering is designed around the needs of administrators, teachers, service providers, para-educators, parents and parent advocates, and those in other educational agencies. NOTE: Prior to 2020, the WDE Special Education Division conducted a yearly statewide in-person conference during the last full week of July; Week of Academic Vision for Excellence (WAVE). This conference included a broad range of topics designed to increase the knowledge and skills of professionals to help improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Due to the pandemic, the format has been restructured to offer high quality training delivered virtually by local and/or nationally esteemed presenters throughout the school year regarding all aspects of IDEA; Web-based Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES).

Targeted PD is specialized and intentionally designed to meet the targeted needs of specific populations of educators and their students. Examples of this would be teachers of the deaf, teachers of the visually impaired, orientation/mobility specialists, behavior specialists, teachers of students with emotional disabilities, etc.

Regardless of the type of PD, the topics are always decided annually as a result of a department wide, two-day data drill down. This is heavily weighted

towards special education data, but also includes data or information provided from the assessment division, school improvement division, school fiscal support division, accreditation team, and federal programs division.

For this reporting period nearly all of the Universal PD was offered virtually due to the COVID pandemic. Through an extensive analysis of Wyoming's monitoring and dispute resolution data, it was determined that the areas of comprehensive evaluation, compliant IEPs, progress monitoring, and delivering quality education and services through a virtual format were areas for improvement. Therefore, the WAVES sessions were focused in these areas and offered to all educators, parents, and advocates. Local and national experts delivered PD sessions 2-4 times per month for which the content included, in part, comprehensive evaluations, IEP goal writing, FAPE in Light of COVID (k-12 and pre-k), social emotional learning, trauma informed practices, Avoiding Pitfalls in the IEP Process, Identifying and Overcoming Special Education Issues in a Virtual Setting, quality progress monitoring and reporting to parents, and a variety of T1, T2, and T3 instructional supports for in-person and virtual learning.

For this reporting period, Targeted PD was provided when the SEA identified, through data and/or noncompliance, a wide-spread need around specific topics. There was a primary focus on providing PD to those who work with children and students with low-incidence disabilities. Targeted PD was provided on emergent literacy skills for students with significant intellectual disabilities, parent support and training for students with significant intellectual disabilities, programming for the unique needs of students who are blind/low vision, deaf/hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, cultural considerations when working with Native American students and tribal communities, instruction for educational interpreters, quality transitions for students who are deaf/hard of hearing, and behavioral strategies and considerations for students with emotional disabilities.

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

#### **The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

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

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

17

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The inclusion of and focus on gaining parent's perspectives has been of the highest priority since the beginning of the stakeholder input process. During the "Setting the Stage" phase, the SEA staff conducted an in-person training to provide exposure and an explanation of the IDEA indicators, as well as the intent, purpose, and operationalization of the Wyoming State Performance Plan (SPP). The audience was the WY Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD) and Parent Information Center (PIC) staff. The SEA felt this was a critical step in the process in order to provide parents with a working knowledge of the indicators before asking them to assist the State in making high stakes decisions about the targets all LEAs, as well as the State, will be measured against for the next five years. During this meeting, parents were engaged through a PowerPoint presentation, round-table discussions, formal and informal question and answer opportunities, and were given take-home materials.

In the phase "Where Are We?" the goal was to inform all the stakeholders on how the State was performing on all measured areas of Special Education (the SPP indicators). The SEA devoted a lot of time and resources to this phase. A conscious effort was made to add parents who are not necessarily on advisory panels or on committees. The SEA reached out to parents who had filed a state complaint, requested mediation, was involved in a due process hearing, or had contacted the SEA for assistance or resources (identified through call logs). In addition, each of the 48 K-12 school districts and the Behavioral Health Division which oversees all of the preschool regions were contacted to disseminate the invitation to all parents of students with disabilities. Parents were involved in a series of the State of the State in Special Education data meetings. One all-day meeting encompassed Special Education data for ages 3-21; all indicators (57 attendees; 10 of whom were parents). There were also several additional follow up options; 3 (repeated) all-day meetings for indicators pertaining to ages 5-21 and two (repeated) all-day meetings focused on early childhood data and indicators for 3-5 year olds. This gave parents multiple choices of possible meetings to attend. During these meetings, parents were again engaged through a presentation, round-table discussions, ability to formally and informally ask questions, and were given take-home materials. Parents were eligible for a \$250 stipend if they committed to two full days; the all-day broad special education data meeting which addressed all data ages 3-21 and one addition day (either K-12 or early childhood focused).

Finally, for the target setting meetings, parents attended again with a broader set of stakeholders for two full days of virtual target setting meetings. During these meetings parents attended large group sessions and multiple breakout sessions where they had four tasks; 1.) Weigh in on the proposed target options, 2.) Identify barriers districts and preschool regions might encounter while trying to meet the goal, 3.) Identify improvement strategies the State could implement that would facilitate achieving the target, and 4.) Identify ways we can know if it's working and producing the desired outcomes. Parents were able to ask questions, make statements and suggestions, or anonymously give feedback and comments via a Jam Board option.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

For the reporting period, there were several activities implemented to assist and engage parents and families to facilitate improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Several diverse groups of parents and families were targeted for specific reasons.

The Wyoming Early Intervention Initiative educates families on quality intervention services for children who is deaf or hard of hearing (DHH), ages birth through five. This outlines intention strategies, provides resources, and connects community partners with families. The WDE entered into a grant with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Workforce Services to educate parents and families supporting DHH students who are transitioning to post-secondary life. We also supported an organization called "Hands and Voices", which is a parent organization to provide support to families of DHH students ages birth through 21 regarding a variety of issues specific to that population of children. The WDE supports the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) program which works closely with the families of babies born with hearing loss.

The WDE also conducted a year-long initiative to provide training about early/emergent literacy strategies for parents of students with significant intellectual disabilities. This kicked off with an in-person training and was ongoing through various web-based trainings.

A transdisciplinary play-based assessment clinic was held in Casper. Four children were assessed. These assessments were based on needs identified by the family and school staff. Clinic staff observed students and met with parents prior to the assessment and parents and school personnel observed and provided information during the assessment.

The WDE collaborated with the Western Regional Early Intervention Collaborative and the Texas School for the Blind to bring monthly webinars, related to the needs of children who are blind/low vision, deaf/hard of hearing and deaf-blind, to service providers, teachers and parents. These included: Unilateral Hearing Loss, Early Intervention Face to Face and Virtual, Serving Native American Families and Tribal Communities, Deaf/Hard of Hearing Early Intervention, Supporting Families, and Parent Coaching Through Connections.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

To reach and engage the public, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information, and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website. Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26, 527 people across our State.

Once the site was accessed, there were several components to each indicator that were requested. First, the respondent was given an explanation of the indicator, historical data, and asked to choose a target from a set of proposed choices, or name one of their own. Next, the State solicited comments on perceived barriers that may impede districts and preschool regions from achieving the target. Additionally, the next step was to ask the respondents what improvement strategies the State could implement that would help facilitate LEA's to reach the target. Stakeholders took part in Jam Board activities to collect and memorialize their input on improvement efforts. The WDE took the information back to the Professional Development and Technical Assistance team to add to their planning efforts for the coming year. Finally, there was the ability to make any further comments, as well as weigh in on ways to identify outputs (data) to know if the improvement strategies are achieving the desired outcome. For many years the WDE has and will continue to meet annually with the Stakeholder group to review special education data, update on improvement strategies, and get further ideas into ways to address Stakeholder concerns. Further input is solicited and considered on a regular basis.

The WDE used all of its list serves, mass mail groups, and Facebook followers to reach as many people as possible. There was a six weeks open period in which to provide feedback.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

When the various stakeholder meetings were concluded (in all phases) and the public input window had closed, the WDE had an internal leadership meeting to carefully select targets in each area. All of the valuable feedback was considered before choosing a target. It was important to consider the barriers identified by stakeholders for reaching targets, as many had the "on-the-ground" perspective.

A comprehensive report was compiled which outlines who participated and provided input (numbers, demographics, roles, etc.), the results of the voting on proposed targets, the targets selected, the list of barriers identified, and the list of the improvement strategies the stakeholders would like to see implemented.

This report was sent to every person who attended any one of the various stakeholder meetings, the members of the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities' (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center, as well as posted publicly.

Moving forward, the stakeholders will meet annually to review the data and examine the targets to see if the State is on trend to meet the targets. The group will evaluate whether or not the set targets are appropriate, rigorous enough, and achievable. In addition, the stakeholders will review the outcome data for the improvement strategies the State is implementing and suggest further possible action.

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, 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 made available 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 Wyoming Instructional Network (WINWEB) website:

<https://wyominginstructionalnetwork.com/idea-special-education-resources/idea/spp-apr/>

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

### **Intro - OSEP Response**

### **Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	57.88%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	64.00%
Data	59.08%	64.50%	61.08%	62.71%	64.71%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	57.88%	57.88%	58.21%	58.98%	59.40%	62.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow

enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	514
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	64
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	18
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	166

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
514	762	64.71%	57.88%	67.45%	Met target	N/A

#### Graduation Conditions

##### Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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

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

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

##### 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)**

FFY2019 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the baseline as this was the last pre-COVID data point and therefore believed to be the most reliable data point to use as a baseline. Note that we indicate that the baseline graduation rate is 57.88% for FFY2019; however, the Data Table shows the FFY2019 graduation rate to be 64.71%. The reason for the discrepancy is that the WDE re-calculated the FFY2019 rate to be based on EdFacts File FS009 in order to use the same calculation methodology that is used for the FFY2020 graduation rate. In determining what the baseline was for Indicator 1, the WDE and stakeholders examined recalculated graduation rates using the FS009 for several years. The FFY2020 data point, which is the first "COVID" year (based on 2019-20 data), was unusually high compared to previous years (and thus believed to be an anomaly) which is why the WDE and the stakeholders chose FFY2019 (the most recent pre-COVID year) as the baseline. This was believed to be the most reliable data point for the graduation rate.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (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 FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	34.76%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	6.15%	6.10%	6.05%	6.00%	6.10%
Data	5.39%	5.44%	6.21%	6.16%	5.99%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	33.19%	33.19%	32.78%	32.38%	30.62%	29.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year.

During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	514
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	64
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	18
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	166

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
166	762	5.99%	33.19%	21.78%	Met target	N/A

**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

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

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

FFY2019 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the baseline as this was the last pre-COVID data point and therefore believed to be the most reliable data point to use as a baseline. Note that we indicate that the baseline drop-out rate is 34.76% from FFY2019; however, the Data Table shows the FFY2019 drop-out rate to be 5.99%. The reason for the discrepancy is that the WDE re-calculated the FFY2019 rate to be based on EdFacts File FS009 in order to use the same calculation methodology that is used for the FFY2020 drop-out rate. In determining what the baseline was for Indicator 2, the WDE and stakeholders examined recalculated drop-out rates using the FS009 for several years. The FFY2020 data point, which is the first "COVID" year (based on 2019-20 data), was unusually low compared to previous years (and thus believed to be an anomaly) which is why the WDE and the stakeholders chose FFY2019 (the most recent pre-COVID year) as the baseline. This was believed to be the most reliable data point for the drop-out rate.

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	97.12%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	96.08%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	93.30%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	97.03%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	95.99%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	93.65%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversees the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

## FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

03/30/2022

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,145	996	1,732
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	543	376	699
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	498	501	785
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	71	80	132

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,145	997	1,732
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	632	495	1,036
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	408	381	455
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	71	81	131

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,112	1,145		95.00%	97.12%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	957	996		95.00%	96.08%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,616	1,732		95.00%	93.30%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,111	1,145		95.00%	97.03%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	957	997		95.00%	95.99%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,622	1,732		95.00%	93.65%	N/A	N/A

**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.

<https://edu.wyoming.gov/data/assessment-reports>. NOTE: the participation rate is displayed in the assessment results reports.

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

OSEP has changed Indicator 3 and its sub-indicators to be for grades 4, 8, and high school, therefore baselines for each of these groups had to be selected. The WDE and its stakeholders selected FFY2020 as the baseline because it is the most recent data point and is believed to be the most reliable data point going forward for the next several years.

**3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3A - OSEP Response**

The State revised baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3A - Required Actions**



## Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	19.69%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	16.88%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	12.47%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	21.63%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	11.76%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.24%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	19.69%	19.69%	19.92%	20.14%	20.60%	21.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	16.88%	16.88%	17.27%	17.66%	18.44%	20.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	12.47%	12.47%	12.85%	13.22%	13.98%	15.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	21.63%	21.63%	21.87%	22.10%	22.57%	23.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	11.76%	11.76%	11.98%	12.19%	12.63%	13.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.24%	7.24%	7.46%	7.68%	8.12%	9.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for

disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was “Where Are We?” which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming’s data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large “Data Drilldown”; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, “Public Reporting”, is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,041	877	1,484
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	141	82	127
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	64	66	58

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,040	876	1,491
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	171	62	82
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	54	41	26

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	205	1,041		19.69%	19.69%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	148	877		16.88%	16.88%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	185	1,484		12.47%	12.47%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	225	1,040		21.63%	21.63%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	103	876		11.76%	11.76%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	108	1,491		7.24%	7.24%	N/A	N/A

### **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.**

<https://edu.wyoming.gov/data/assessment-reports/>

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

OSEP has changed Indicator 3 and its sub-indicators to be for grades 4, 8, and high school, therefore baselines for each of these groups had to be selected. The WDE and its stakeholders selected FFY2020 as the baseline because it is the most recent data point and is believed to be the most reliable data point going forward for the next several years.

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3B - OSEP Response**

The State has revised baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	53.52%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	68.75%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	52.27%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	43.66%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	65.43%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	41.98%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	53.52%	53.52%	53.77%	54.02%	54.51%	55.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	68.75%	68.75%	68.91%	69.06%	69.38%	70.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	52.27%	52.27%	52.49%	52.70%	53.14%	54.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	43.66%	43.66%	43.89%	44.12%	44.58%	45.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	65.43%	65.43%	65.69%	65.95%	66.47%	67.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	41.98%	41.98%	42.24%	42.49%	42.99%	44.00%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversees the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

## FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

03/03/2022

## Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	71	80	132
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	38	55	69

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	71	81	131
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	31	53	55

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	38	71		53.52%	53.52%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	55	80		68.75%	68.75%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	69	132		52.27%	52.27%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	31	71		43.66%	43.66%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	53	81		65.43%	65.43%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	55	131		41.98%	41.98%	N/A	N/A

**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.

<https://edu.wyoming.gov/data/assessment-reports/>

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

OSEP has changed Indicator 3 and its sub-indicators to be for grades 4, 8, and high school, therefore baselines for each of these groups had to be selected. The WDE and its stakeholders selected FFY2020 as the baseline because it is the most recent data point and is believed to be the most reliable data point going forward for the next several years.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3C - OSEP Response**

The State has revised baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3C - Required Actions**



## Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	28.92
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	43.68
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	39.61
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	28.21
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	38.96
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	35.94

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	28.92	28.92	28.80	28.67	28.42	27.92
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	43.68	43.68	43.56	43.43	43.18	42.68
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	39.61	39.61	39.49	39.36	39.11	38.61
Math	A <=	Grade 4	28.21	28.21	28.08	27.96	27.71	27.21
Math	B <=	Grade 8	38.96	38.96	38.84	38.71	38.46	37.96
Math	C <=	Grade HS	35.94	35.94	35.82	35.69	35.44	34.94

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete

measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

### FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	6,679	7,228	13,597
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,041	877	1,484
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,170	4,297	7,001
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	77	80	80
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	141	82	127

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	64	66	58
---	----	----	----

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	6,675	7,214	13,644
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,040	876	1,491
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,247	3,603	5,847
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	80	56	45
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	171	62	82
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	54	41	26

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	19.69%	48.62%		28.92	28.92	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	16.88%	60.56%		43.68	43.68	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	12.47%	52.08%		39.61	39.61	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.63%	49.84%		28.21	28.21	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	11.76%	50.72%		38.96	38.96	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.24%	43.18%		35.94	35.94	N/A	N/A

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

OSEP has changed Indicator 3 and its sub-indicators to be for grades 4, 8, and high school, therefore baselines for each of these groups had to be selected. The WDE and its stakeholders selected FFY2020 as the baseline because it is the most recent data point and is believed to be the most reliable data point going forward for the next several years.

### **3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3D - OSEP Response**

The State has established baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

3

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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 2020 state rate (based on 2019-20 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.48%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.48% 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 2020 for Indicator 4A. In the entire state of Wyoming, only 78 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2020. Only eight LEAs had a suspension rate greater than 0%, and none had a suspension rate greater than 5.48%. 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 LEAs had a 0% suspension rate.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

5

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	44	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 2020 state rate (based on 2019-20 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities for more than ten days is 0.48%. The WDE is setting the state bar as five percentage points higher than the state rate. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 5.48% 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, one was identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2020 for Indicator 4B. In the entire state of Wyoming, only 78 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2020. 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.) Only one was identified as having significant discrepancy in FFY 2020 for Indicator 4B. Only eight LEAs had a suspension rate greater than 0%. Of these eight LEAs, one was excluded for a given race/ethnicity rate because there were not at least 25 students in the denominator (for this LEA, only one student was 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, 44 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 2020 using 2019-2020 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 review of a district's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of Individualized Education Program (IEPs), the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA are included in WDE's compliance monitoring process as required by 34 CFR§ 300.170(b). All 49 Wyoming LEA's participate in the Stable Assessment component on an annual basis. The Stable Assessment includes a review conducted by LEA staff and several activities conducted by WDE monitoring teams. The self-assessment portion of the Stable Assessment includes a measure of procedural compliance with several key federal and state requirements and every LEA is expected to maintain 100% compliance with all of them. The WDE further analyzes district-level data to determine areas of potential noncompliance and identifies LEAs who may have policies and/or procedures that indicate suspension or expulsion practices that have a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity. When data flags an LEA for a possible discrepancy, a review of district's policies, practices, and individual IEPs are

conducted. During the record review, the most current evaluation report, IEP, discipline records, and corresponding documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met. As part of the State's review, staff interviews are completed to gain a deeper understanding of the district's policies, procedures, and practices. Questions regarding discriminatory practices and procedures also are asked of general education leadership and directors of special education. As a result of this review, the one flagged district was NOT found to have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to a significant discrepancy, or do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedures. Therefore, no revisions of policies, procedures or practices were required at the SEA or LEA levels.

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 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. 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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	62.34%	62.59%	62.84%	63.09%	65.09%
A	73.93%	Data	65.38%	66.86%	68.59%	70.71%	73.93%
B	2019	Target <=	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	6.75%	6.50%
B	5.42%	Data	6.49%	6.10%	6.23%	5.77%	5.42%
C	2019	Target <=	1.34%	1.34%	1.34%	1.33%	2.00%
C	1.68%	Data	2.00%	1.81%	1.80%	1.77%	1.68%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	73.93%	73.93%	74.00%	74.06%	75.74%	76.00%
Target B <=	5.42%	5.42%	5.37%	5.32%	4.70%	4.50%
Target C <=	1.68%	1.68%	1.61%	1.55%	1.24%	0.97%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and

administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	13,195
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,960
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	646
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	75
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	89
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	35

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 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,960	13,195	73.93%	73.93%	75.48%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	646	13,195	5.42%	5.42%	4.90%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	199	13,195	1.68%	1.68%	1.51%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Given that the calculation changed since the previous baseline of FFY2005, a change in baseline was needed. FFY2019 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the baseline as this was the first year that the WDE included kindergarten students in the Indicator 5 rate.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State did not revise the baseline for this indicator, as required due to the change in the data source. The State must revise its baseline using data from FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

FFY2019 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the baseline as this was the first year that the WDE included kindergarten students in the Indicator 5 rate. Given that the calculation changed, a change in baseline was needed.

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). 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 IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	61.98%	62.23%	62.48%	62.73%	67.50%
A	Data	65.19%	59.90%	69.26%	76.04%	72.57%
B	Target <=	28.51%	28.26%	28.01%	27.76%	22.50%
B	Data	25.25%	30.85%	23.95%	18.25%	20.55%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in

attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

### Targets

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

### Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	71.25%
B	2020	17.99%
C	2020	1.16%

### Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	71.25%	71.25%	71.47%	71.69%	72.13%	73.25%
Target B <=	17.99%	17.99%	17.74%	17.49%	17.00%	16.00%

### Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.16%	1.16%	1.15%	1.15%	1.13%	1.10%

### Prepopulated Data

#### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

#### Date:

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	798	1,148	200	2,146
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	571	828	130	1,529
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	130	134	29	293
b2. Number of children attending separate school	27	53	13	93
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	6	14	5	25

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 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	1,529	2,146	72.57%	71.25%	71.25%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	386	2,146	20.55%	17.99%	17.99%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	25	2,146		1.16%	1.16%	N/A	N/A

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

Given that the calculation changed since the previous baseline of FFY2011, a change in baseline was needed. FFY2020 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the new baseline as this reflects the best depiction of current LRE in preschool settings. Indicator 6 has been impacted at least somewhat by COVID. Prior to FFY2020, a very small percentage of children were served in the home (less than .5%). In FFY2020, this rate increased to 1.16%. This is due to some parents being reluctant to bring their children into a center for services due to COVID.

#### 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not revise the baseline for this indicator, as required due to the change in the data source. The State must revise its baseline using data from FFY 2019.

#### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

FFY2020 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the new baseline as this reflects the best depiction of current LRE in preschool settings. Indicator 6 has been impacted at least somewhat by COVID. Prior to FFY2020, a very small percentage of children were served in the home (less than .5%). In FFY2020, this rate increased to 1.16%. This is due to some parents being reluctant to bring their children into a center for services due to COVID.

#### 6 - OSEP Response

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to revise its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2019. The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 and provided an explanation. OSEP accepts the revised baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target >=	87.60%	87.70%	87.90%	89.50%	79.00%
A1	78.33%	Data	90.76%	88.33%	87.79%	78.78%	63.91%
A2	2020	Target >=	57.33%	57.53%	57.53%	59.13%	75.00%

A2	82.73%	Data	59.49%	59.25%	76.05%	81.67%	73.64%
B1	2020	Target >=	89.37%	89.47%	89.67%	91.27%	61.15%
B1	79.88%	Data	92.57%	84.71%	70.34%	59.25%	47.19%
B2	2020	Target >=	53.82%	53.92%	54.12%	55.72%	57.50%
B2	58.22%	Data	61.60%	54.87%	54.53%	57.26%	55.65%
C1	2020	Target >=	89.28%	89.38%	89.58%	91.18%	64.00%
C1	83.44%	Data	91.56%	86.30%	78.50%	61.25%	42.19%
C2	2020	Target >=	68.65%	68.75%	68.95%	70.55%	70.25%
C2	71.15%	Data	74.89%	70.84%	72.47%	69.99%	65.69%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	78.33%	78.33%	78.54%	78.75%	79.17%	80.00%
Target A2 >=	82.73%	82.73%	82.89%	83.05%	83.37%	84.00%
Target B1 >=	79.88%	79.88%	80.15%	80.41%	80.94%	82.00%
Target B2 >=	58.22%	58.22%	58.44%	58.67%	59.11%	60.00%
Target C1 >=	83.44%	83.44%	83.70%	83.96%	84.47%	85.50%
Target C2 >=	71.15%	71.15%	71.38%	71.61%	72.08%	73.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There

were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

967

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	78	8.07%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	89	9.20%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	193	19.96%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	607	62.77%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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>	282	360	63.91%	78.33%	78.33%	N/A	N/A
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>	800	967	73.64%	82.73%	82.73%	N/A	N/A

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	134	13.86%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	270	27.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	262	27.09%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	301	31.13%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	532	666	47.19%	79.88%	79.88%	N/A	N/A
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>	563	967	55.65%	58.22%	58.22%	N/A	N/A

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

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	108	11.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	171	17.68%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	373	38.57%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	315	32.57%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	544	652	42.19%	83.44%	83.44%	N/A	N/A
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	688	967	65.69%	71.15%	71.15%	N/A	N/A

**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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

NO

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

"Comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a z-score on the Battelle Developmental Inventory-Second Edition (BDI-II ) of -1.30 or higher.

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

In FFY 2016-17 the state began implementing a new process for reporting performance for this indicator by using the Battelle Developmental Inventory-Second Edition (BDI-II ). WDH, EIEP implemented this change over the course of three (3) reporting years with specific EIS Programs changing to the new reporting process each of the three (3) years. The change to the new process was fully implemented for all newly enrolled infants/toddlers as of June 30, 2019, with all EIS Programs using the BDI-II for both entry and exiting child outcome reporting on skill levels in all five domains.

In 2018-19, all EIS Programs had transitioned to this new process for gathering data on the three outcomes areas. The scoring process for the BDI-II 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. In addition, in 2020-21, the EIEP also (in addition to changes in z-scores) used the Battelle's Change Sensitive Scores (CSS) to measure growth whereas a child who made at least a 20 point gain in CSS (which corresponds to significant growth based on the 90% confidence intervals) from entry to exit was said to have made growth.

Note that there are still some children who, upon entry, used the previous process of the ECO COS for gathering data on the three outcomes areas. Under the previous process, the EIS Programs could use approved tools other than BDI-II. The purpose of the new process is to standardize the process for collecting information and to ensure the data are reliable and valid. The 2020-21 year represented the first year in which almost all exiting children had an entry that was based on the BDI-II process; all had an exit score that is based on the BDI-II process.

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

The WDE and its stakeholders selected the FFY2020 as the baseline year as this represented the first year in which almost all exiting children had an entry that was based on the BDI-II process; all had an exit score that is based on the BDI-II process

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

### 8 - Indicator Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	51.28%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	75.14%	75.39%	75.64%	75.89%	78.50%
Data	80.22%	78.56%	82.11%	83.40%	85.44%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.28%	85.28%	85.50%	85.71%	86.14%	87.00%

#### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,844	3,334	85.44%	85.28%	85.30%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

7,011

Percentage of respondent parents

47.55%



## Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	44.27%	47.55%

### **Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Our overall response rate of 48% is quite high. For the 2021-22 school year, we are requiring all districts to administer their survey to their parents of students with disabilities themselves, and without the assistance of a third-party contractor. Families being contacted by school personnel they already know should increase the response rate even further.

Even though results are representative of parents of students with disabilities across the state, we are taking these steps to encourage a higher percentage of parents of Hispanic and of American Indian students with disabilities to respond. Two of our strategies for increasing this response rate include creating a survey in an auditory format in Spanish (recording) and having a booth at the annual Native American Education Conference to provide families with Special Education resources and an opportunity to complete the survey on-site.

Additionally, we are facilitating a higher percentage of parents of all students with all disabilities to respond by having an auditory format and in braille to access the survey other than in traditional print.

Lastly, all districts are encouraging their all their parents to respond and providing an opportunity for their parents to respond. This will be very helpful for those districts that have a predominantly Native American population (as well as for all districts).

### **Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias. One is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. Our response rate is 48%, which is fairly high.

Second, the representativeness of the responses can be examined. We describe this in the next question where we state: The State used statistical significance testing to determine if one group was over- or under-represented based on their response rate. Although significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and disability, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed no significant differences in the overall parent involvement percentage.

Third, we can compare the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no difference between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later. Therefore, we conclude that nonresponse bias is not present.

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

The State used statistical significance testing of response rate to determine if one group was over-or under-represented. Note that our survey sample was such that if all disaggregated groups have the same response rate, then by definition, the disaggregated groups are representative of the population. For example, if all racial/ethnic groups had a 30% response rate, then the population of the respondents would mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. On the other hand, if one racial/ethnic group has a 30% response rate for example and another a 20% response rate, then the population of the respondents would not mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. Significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and disability of the child. In terms of race/ethnicity, parents of White students were more likely to respond (response rate=23%) than parents of Hispanic students (response rate=16%) and parents of American Indian students (response rate=15%). In terms of disability, parents of students with a Learning Disability (response rate=17%) and parents of a student with Other Health Impairment (response rate=14%) were less likely to respond than parents of students with other disabilities. To give an example of how the response rate analysis is a reflection of an analysis where the population demographics are compared to the respondent demographics, in the population 27% of students with disabilities have a Learning Disability and 14% have an Other Health Impairment. In the respondents, 22% of the parents who responded have a student with a Learning Disability and 9% have a student with an Other Health Impairment. As can be seen, the response rate analysis and the "demographic proportion" analysis lead to the same conclusion, i.e., the WDE needs to encourage a higher percentage of parents of students with a Learning Disability and parents of a student with an Other Health Impairment to respond to the survey.

Although there are a few significant differences in response rates between groups of parents by race/ethnicity there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage itself between parents of different races/ethnicities. For example, parents of White students had a similar parent involvement percentage as parents of Hispanic students and parents of American Indian students. Additionally, while there were differences in the response rates between groups of parents by disability, there were very few significant differences in the parent involvement percentage itself between these parents of different disabilities. So, we are confident that the overall results are representative of the State despite the differences in response rates. Parents from a wide range of districts from across the state responded to the survey. Furthermore, results are weighted by district to ensure that the parent survey results reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution. Thus, the results are representative of all geographic regions, all racial/ethnic groups, and all disability categories.

### **The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

### **If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

As was stated above: Our overall response rate of 48% is quite high. For the 2021-22 school year, we are requiring all districts to administer their survey to their parents of students with disabilities themselves, and without the assistance of a third-party contractor. Families being contacted by school personnel they already know should increase the response rate even further.

Even though results are representative of parents of students with disabilities across the state, (i.e., for parents of students with disabilities across the state), we are taking these steps to encourage a higher percentage of parents of Hispanic and of American Indian students with disabilities to respond. Two of our strategies for increasing this response rate include creating a survey in an auditory format in Spanish (recording) and having a booth at the

annual Native American Education Conference to provide families with Special Education resources and an opportunity to complete the survey on-site.

Additionally, we are facilitating a higher percentage of parents of all students with all disabilities to respond by having an auditory format and in braille to access the survey other than in traditional print.

Lastly, all districts are encouraging their all their parents to respond and providing an opportunity for their parents to respond. This will be very helpful for those districts that have a predominantly Native American population (as well as for all districts).

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Statistical significance testing of response rate was used to determine representativeness with a threshold of  $p < 0.05$ .

Sampling Question	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.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

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

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

**8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

## 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 the reporting year, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	48	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 WDE 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 a Risk Ratio for each school district in the state, based on the identification rate of each racial/ethnic group in each district. If there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (cell size) and 30 or more students in the group of interest enrolled in the LEA (n size) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group (cell size) and 30 or more students in the comparison group (n size) enrolled in the LEA, the Risk Ratio is used; otherwise, if there are fewer than 10 students with disabilities in the comparison group, the Alternate Risk Ratio is used. Using both the Risk Ratio and the Alternate Risk Ratio ensures that the largest numbers of identification rates are considered for disproportionate representation.

The WDE defines disproportionate representation as a Final 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 size 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 in preschool; as such Indicators 9 and 10 are irrelevant to this preschool district. This preschool district does not serve any five-year-old kindergarten students. 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 in kindergarten through grade 12.)

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 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 2020, 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	43	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

**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 WDE 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 a Risk Ratio for each school district in the state, based on the identification rate of each racial/ethnic group in each district. If there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (cell size) and 30 or more students in the group of interest enrolled in the LEA (n size) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group (cell size) and 30 or more students in the comparison group (n size) enrolled in the LEA, the Risk Ratio is used; otherwise, if there are fewer than 10 students with disabilities in the comparison group, the Alternate Risk Ratio is used. Using both the Risk Ratio and the Alternate Risk Ratio ensures that the largest numbers of identification rates are considered for disproportionate representation.

The WDE defines disproportionate representation as a Final 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 48 public K-12 school districts are included in the analyses. Of these 48 LEAs, 43 met the minimum size 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 in preschool; as such Indicators 9 and 10 are irrelevant to this preschool district. This preschool district does not serve any five-year-old kindergarten students. 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 in kindergarten through grade 12.)

**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 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	95.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.68%	98.34%	98.55%	98.43%	99.39%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,782	3,734	99.39%	100%	98.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

48

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

Of the 3,782 initial evaluations under Part B conducted during FFY 2020, there were 48 that did not meet the 60-day timeline requirement. Of these 48, 15 were from the State's 48 public school districts, and 33 were from the State's developmental preschools. The range in days beyond the 60-day timeline was 1 to 87 days. Reasons for the delays in evaluations: parental cancellations of meetings, difficulty contacting parents, and incorrect calculation of 60-day timeline. Further technical assistance was provided to LEAs to assist with compliance in this area. This included the dissemination of official guidance documents developed by the State and guidance produced by the US Department of Education and the Office of Special Education Programs.

**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) which is submitted by the LEAs to the WDE.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19		0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Regarding the 19 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 contacted 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 was 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 issued a letter containing findings for each of the students in whose case initial evaluations took longer than 60 days. LEAs were 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 2020-21 school year. Then, in order to ensure systemic correction for all students, the WDE reviewed 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. The Department verified the LEAs with noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, per the OSEP 09-02 memo.

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. The self-assessment process was explained in the General Supervision section of the introduction.

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

For the 19 individual students for whom noncompliance was found, the State ensured each evaluation was completed and eligibility determined. For each responsible school/agency, the State reviewed the policies and procedures for comprehensive evaluations and received an assurance to comply with the regulation's timeline. In addition, the State conducted a follow up activity of reviewing new evaluations conducted by those agencies to ensure the 60-day timeline was adhered to. This was completed within one year and is consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

See the previous section on how the WDE addressed FFY2019 findings of noncompliance.

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## 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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	68.29%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.64%	88.47%	94.38%	92.06%	97.99%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	505
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	43

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	342
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.	39
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	2
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	342	421	97.99%	100%	81.24%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

COVID has impacted the timeliness of evaluations. Many parents did not make the child readily available due to COVID concerns. The Child Development Centers were still expected to provide timely evaluations, despite COVID; however, the 2020-21 school year was challenging.

**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**

79

**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 79 children for whom their Part B eligibility was not determined by their third birthday. The number of days after their third birthday ranged from 1 to 178. Six of the children had delays of 30 days or less. The Behavioral Health Division (BHD) provided justifications for the delays such as parents not making the child available and data errors. In some cases, no justification was given, indicating procedural errors. For the findings of noncompliance in cases where the parent did not make the child available, it was determined that the preschool staff did not make an early or adequate attempt to complete the evaluations to determine eligibility prior to the child's third birthday. There was not sufficient documentation to show multiple attempts or, in fact, the file showed the evaluation process was started without allowing for adequate time to complete. For these reasons, the WDE feels that stating (in the justification) that the parent did not make the child available does not meet the intent of the allowable exception in 34 CFR 300.301(d).

Further technical assistance was provided to the BHD to assist with compliance in this area. This included the dissemination of guidance documents developed by the State and guidance produced by the US Department of Education and the Office of Special Education Programs.

**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 (WDE-457) which is submitted by the Behavioral Health Division to the WDE.

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

The WDE has issued the Behavioral Health Division (BHD) a letter of notice of noncompliance for the results of Indicator 12 for this reporting period. The BHD is essentially the LEA responsible for the Part B implementation of the IDEA regulations in each of the 14 Early Childhood Regions serving students with disabilities ages 3-5 and not enrolled in kindergarten. The BHD then issued letters of noncompliance with accompanying Corrective Action Plans (CAP) to preschool regions with substantial noncompliance with their Part C to Part B transitions. Each CAP may include improvement activities, a review of policies and procedures with revisions if necessary, and required staff training for compliant Part C to Part B transitions.

For this indicator, none of the late evaluations were due to parents refusing to provide consent.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7		0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

All noncompliance for the FFY2019 (the 7 evaluations) were timely corrected within the one-year time-frame. Each region with noncompliance in FFY2019 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 with 100% compliance—in this case 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b). This was achieved by reviewing new documentation on a sample of children 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).

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

Regarding the 7 initial evaluations that were not completed on time, the WDE required specific corrective action from any preschool region exhibiting a rate below 100% compliance. First, the Department contacted each preschool region with the identification numbers of children whose IEP was not developed and implemented by their third birthday. In each instance, the region was required to provide an explanation for the delay. The BHD issued a letter containing findings for each of the children whose transition from Part C to Part B was late. Regions were required to provide evidence that the child's evaluation was completed, although late, unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the BHD. In addition, the WDE required an assurance that the region's policies and procedures concerning Part C to Part B transitions have been reviewed with region staff members during the 2020-21 school year. Thus, the WDE reviewed each individual case of noncompliance and verified that each case of noncompliance was corrected.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

See the previous section on how the WDE addressed FFY2019 findings of noncompliance.

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2009	54.58%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	87.29%	93.67%	98.50%	99.24%	97.40%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
401	406	97.40%	100%	98.77%	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 2-10 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.

Question	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 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10		0

**FFY 2019 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 of the five LEAs that had noncompliance identified are 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 November 2020. The WDE's review of these students' documentation during the spring of 2021 demonstrated that 100% of the files reviewed were compliant and the LEAs in question were following proper IEP transition practices.

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

As reported in the State's FFY 2019 APR under Indicator 13, the WDE made findings of noncompliance for 10 students across five LEAs in this area during that fiscal year. In conducting its verification process, the WDE determined that each of the five LEAs 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 2021. The five LEAs in question were required to submit Prior Written Notice forms and revised IEPs detailing the corrections made on each student's behalf. For each of the 10 student files found noncompliant, 100% (all 10) of those files were corrected and made compliant within one year.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

See the previous section on how the WDE addressed FFY2019 findings of noncompliance.

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### 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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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":

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### 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 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. States should consider categories such as race/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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	26.68%	26.93%	27.18%	27.43%	27.00%
A	16.83%	Data	29.55%	26.43%	22.47%	25.22%	21.17%
B	2020	Target >=	58.62%	58.87%	59.12%	59.37%	60.00%
B	60.08%	Data	55.40%	57.29%	58.10%	65.40%	61.71%
C	2020	Target >=	73.77%	74.27%	74.77%	75.75%	76.00%
C	74.36%	Data	71.31%	71.25%	74.09%	79.02%	75.68%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	19.00%	19.00%	20.18%	21.35%	23.35%	26.00%
Target B >=	59.00%	59.00%	59.39%	59.78%	60.95%	62.50%
Target C >=	73.00%	73.00%	73.34%	73.68%	75.15%	76.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the “Setting the Stage” phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete

measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was “Where Are We?” which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming’s data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large “Data Drilldown”; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, “Public Reporting”, is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	731
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	511
Response Rate	69.90%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	86
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	221
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	39
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).	34

Measure	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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	86	511	21.17%	19.00%	16.83%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	307	511	61.71%	59.00%	60.08%	N/A	N/A
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)	380	511	75.68%	73.00%	74.36%	N/A	N/A

**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.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	70.48%	69.90%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Our overall response rate of about 70% is very high and is similar to last year's response rate.

Even though results are representative of students with disabilities across the state, we are taking these steps to encourage more youth who dropped out to respond. Additional prompts (attempts) to reach students who exited with a code of dropping out will be employed in the spring/summer of 2022. It is believed that information from this group of students will be valuable in guiding the State's technical assistance and professional development activities regarding dropout prevention strategies.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias. One is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. Our response rate is 70%, which is high.

Second, the representativeness of the responses can be examined. Our results are representative of the state as a whole based on race/ethnicity, basis of exit, and disability of the youth (see representative question). While differences exist in the response rates between different groups of exiters, there were very few differences in the actual responses of these exiters. In addition, we received responses from a broad geographic range of students from across the state from multiple districts which make nonresponse bias less likely.

Third, we can compare the responses of exiters who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no statistically significant differences between exiters who responded earlier and exiters who responded later. Therefore, we conclude that nonresponse bias is not present.

**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 State used statistical significance testing of response rate to determine if one group was over- or under-represented. No significant differences were found by the race/ethnicity, disability, or gender of youth. Significant differences were found in response rates by basis of exit. Exiters who graduated with a diploma (response rate=75%) or reached maximum age (response rate=83%) were significantly more likely to respond than students who dropped out (response rate=52%).

Although there were some significant differences in the responses by type of exit, we are still confident that overall results are representative of the state. Exiters from a wide range of districts (i.e., geography) from across the state responded to the survey; thus, the results are representative of all racial/ethnic groups, all disability categories, all genders, and all exiters regardless of exit type.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

As was state above, our overall response rate of about 70% is very high and is similar to last year's response rate.

Even though results are representative of students with disabilities across the state, (i.e., for exiting students with disabilities across the state), we are taking these steps to encourage more youth who dropped out to respond. Additional prompts (attempts) to reach students who exited with a code of dropping out will be employed in the spring/summer of 2022. It is believed that information from this group of students will be valuable in guiding the State's technical assistance and professional development activities regarding dropout prevention strategies.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Statistical significance testing of response rate was used to determine representativeness with a threshold of  $p < 0.05$ .

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

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

While slippage is not significant enough to require explanation, it is important to note that since the COVID pandemic, students with disabilities enrolled in higher education has decreased by 4.34%. This is not surprising and higher education enrollment rates for ALL students in Wyoming during the same time period has decreased by 6.51%.

The WDE and its stakeholders selected FFY2020 as the baseline because it is believed to be the most reliable data point going forward for the next several years due to COVID's impact on education and employment. The WDE and its stakeholders do not believe that the Indicator 14A rate will revert back to pre-COVID rates any time soon.

It may be noted that the FFY2020 target rates for 14B and 14C are lower than the actual statewide rates for 14B and 14C, respectively. Stakeholders looked at the variability in district scores and believed the targets chosen for 14B and 14C were the best targets for the state as well as the districts.

#### 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

#### 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 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, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its 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.

## 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 EDFacts 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 and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	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

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and

shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data	100.00%		0.00%	50.00%	

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	3			66.67%	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 2020. 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversee the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically

meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%	100.00%	75.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

#### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	75.00%			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 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

#### 16 - Required Actions

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

###### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

**C. Stakeholder Engagement**

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

**17 - Indicator Data**

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The percentage of third grade students with disabilities will increase their state test reading proficiency from 23.63% in 2017-18\* to 29.63% in 2019-20. \*Note: Baseline year is 2017-18 -- when the WYTOPP was first administered.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

Grade 3 students with disabilities.

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

<https://wyoinginstructionalnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WYSSIP-Theory-of-Action-508Compliant.pdf>

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The data show that progress is being made. Grade 3 reading proficiency rates are increasing.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).**

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	23.63%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>= =	23.63%	23.63%	24.04%	24.46%	27.35%	29.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

# of grade 3 SWD test-takers scoring proficient/advanced	# of grade 3 SWD test-takers	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
310	1,206		23.63%	25.70%	Met target	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

WY-TOPP state test

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

Given that our primary data source is the State Test (i.e., WY-TOPP), data are collected and analyzed in the standardized method required by the test. For the data analysis, the proficiency rates were used.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

One of our evaluation measures is an end-of-year survey where the teacher is asked if the student achieved the goal and made progress as a result of the intervention.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

[https://wyominginstructionalnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WYSSIP-Eval-Plan\\_2021-22.pdf](https://wyominginstructionalnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WYSSIP-Eval-Plan_2021-22.pdf)

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

During this reporting period, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) continued to scale up implementation of the evidence-based practice DBI. The WDE has established the Wyoming Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Center to support LEAs in developing and implementing MTSS. Part of this work, involves incorporating and aligning Data-Based Individualization as the tier III framework the state MTSS Center provides training on. The WDE expanded the availability of DBI modules developed during the 2019-2020SY to all educators including those not directly involved in SSIP activities. To ensure educators receive needed support to implement DBI, the WDE established a state-level coaching cadre consisting of experienced practitioners. The coaching cadre is supported and directed by WDE staff through a newly established coaching Community of Practice (CoP). In addition to the Coaching CoP The WDE established CoP specific to building and district level administrators designed to provide knowledge of the DBI framework, intervention, and progress monitoring tool selection. This CoP also provides the opportunity for administrators to collaborate with their peers in districts throughout the state in a professional learning community (PLC) format.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Key items accomplished during 2021-2022 include:

- \* Trained 3 additional DBI coaches as part of WDE's internal coaching cadre
- \* Further refined, in collaboration with the target district, the state's implementation model
- \* Expanded students served by DBI through the 8th grade
- \* Selected, trained, and coached 1 additional internal district coach in the target district
- \* Expanded the availability of 6 DBI modules to all educators
- \* Trained an additional 15 teachers through the LMS modules
- \* Aligned DBI with the state's General Supervision Process.
- \* In collaboration with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), launched a statewide DBI Community of Practice (CoP) with 79 participants
- \* Developed and deployed Community of Practices to support administrators and DBI coaches
- \* Fielded 11 statewide coaches from the target district and previous coaching participants to support the CoP
- \* Aligned DBI efforts for inclusion as the tier III process for the new statewide WYMTSS center
- \* Fielded a State-Level Coaching Cadre to support practitioners and administrators participating in the statewide Community of Practices
- \* Conducted 3 trainings with two districts new to implementation

As an effort to overcome barriers of past years' implementation of the SSIP, the WYSSIP team continued to solicit districts and child development centers (CDC) to serve as project sites for the 5th year Cohort.

The WYSSIP team worked collaboratively with targeted districts leadership and CDC administrators in refining its staged implementation process. In addition to the standardized training series which consists of two-full day trainings with supplemental coaching, a third training option was developed to inform teachers of the PLC teaming process and how to make time effective decisions based on the data collected as part of the DBI project. This professional learning model was designed and fielded in previous implementation years and refined overtime using feedback data and direct stakeholder engagement at the state, local, and practitioner levels.

Three training series were scheduled consisting of two full-day trainings. At each of these two-part trainings the district's teachers and administrators would receive the initial training in the DBI framework. After the initial training was complete, and before the second training was held, the district staff would be given time to assess their own internal processes and needs. The district held a Professional Learning Community (PLC) for teachers and staff to evaluate and assess the interventions currently in use, select new interventions based on provided criteria, review fidelity data to improve implementation, and determine what steps are necessary to intensify interventions to fit within the DBI framework.

During the second training, teachers and administrators received the progress monitoring component of the framework. Teachers and administrators were then given time to select a valid and reliable progress monitoring tool. The district then ensured their staff received training on the chosen progress monitoring tool. It was collectively decided that this model would be a more effective route to implementation as it afforded time and additional resources

for district staff to gain a better understanding of the framework and make more meaningful decisions in the selection of interventions and progress monitoring tools. The additional time also ensured a greater fidelity of implementation once teachers began applying the process. The WDE and its stakeholders determined that a staged implementation lends itself to greater sustainability as it assists the district in building internal capacity. As each successive group of teachers began the training and implementation process there existed teachers and staff internally, within the district, that were familiar with the framework and could provide additional support and guidance through the process.

The third training was developed in collaboration with the target district during a mid-year implementation and fidelity data review. The data review allowed the WYSSIP and target district to tailor follow up training specific to the needs of the district, individual school buildings and the teachers. The data review revealed that there was a need for framework refresher and development of teaming resources to best support teachers through the implementation process.

In addition to standardized training, the WDE selected and trained an additional three staff members to serve as internal coaches. The WDE worked with participating districts by providing coaching training to selected coaches. Monthly coach's meetings were held between WDE and district internal coaches to share information and problem solve as needed.

Available supports were provided to all participating teachers and consists of the following activities: the initial training session, web-based professional development, a monthly defined DBI PLC, quarterly district PLCs, and bi-weekly meetings with DBI project coaches. Each participating teacher gathered and logged data on both a daily and weekly basis. The Data collected includes implementation fidelity data and student level progress data centered on a subset skill based measure. Teachers then had the opportunity to share their findings and address strengths and challenges during the weekly coaching sessions. The continuous review and problem-solving of student-level data has been embedded throughout the process, placing an emphasis on the need to make timely, data-driven instructional changes that will increase the student's reading performance.

In March 2022, the year's DBI coaching project will come to completion with a debriefing meeting for the DBI coaches and participating teachers. The meeting will focus on assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the DBI process. Coaches and participating teachers will work collaboratively to refine the process and improve existing documentation used for the implementation of DBI. The WYSSIP team will then meet to begin planning for the next generation of DBI implementation for the 2022-22 school year and beyond. The discussion will primarily focus on continuous improvement of the process, the identification of a sustainable coaching cohort, the expansion of the implementation model to districts state-wide, and any additional considerations provided through the debriefing meeting.

In 2020-21, the WYSSIP team discussed lessons learned for each of the previous cohorts. In past years the WYSSIP team held stakeholder feedback sessions followed by internal debriefing meetings in early May. This allowed the WYSSIP team to have the summer months to plan for the next year's Cohort. In years past this timeline served the team well as the implementation model relied on a state-wide open call or worked directly with a previously identified district. While attempting to scale up, the team experienced multiple scheduling conflicts with districts. Many of the districts approached for the 4th year Cohort were unable to participate because they had completed their PD schedules in April and lacked adequate time in their PD calendar to accommodate the department's DBI training package. Going forward, the WYSSIP team will hold the stakeholder feedback sessions and internal debriefing meetings earlier in the year in an attempt to get more DBI PD on district calendars.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Based on lessons learned from the 2020-21 year, stakeholder meetings with the target district and Cop participants were held in March and the WYSSIP team is currently working to schedule trainings with interested districts. Utilizing feedback from stakeholders and participants, the Wyoming SSIP Team will determine changes or refinements to our process throughout the 2021-2022 cohort.

In September 2022, the WDE will roll-out the 2022-2023 cohort of DBI implementers. The WDE will continue to provide support to the first through fifth year cohort schools. Previous years' cohort teachers will each mentor an additional special education teacher through a train-the-trainer model. In addition to broadening the cadre of DBI implementers, WDE will continue to solicit other districts interested in pursuing DBI professional development. Expanding into other districts will be supported by our designated MTSS state and district coaches. 2022-2023 cohort participants, including those involved in the community of practice will complete the following activities:

- Series of DBI professional development modules
- Coaches training for identified district coaches and state-level the coaching cadre
- DBI PLC fifth cohort to include new teachers and LEAs
- Annual leadership conference presentations and data share-outs
- Universal PD/TA around DBI and Best Practices in Literacy using the state Learning Management System (LMS)

The SSIP evaluation plan for the 2022-2023 cohort will replicate the current DBI evaluation plan, with additional emphases in these areas:

- Increased number of students
- Increased number of teachers trained in the DBI process
- Additional collection of student-level data
- Ongoing verification of implementation fidelity
- Effectiveness of coaching
- Correlation data of the MTSS Fidelity of Implementation Checklist and the DBI Fidelity of Implementation Checklist
- Relationship between DBI daily or weekly data points and mastery of IEP goals

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

- Develop a cadre of trainers across the state located within their LEA
- Obtain commitment from future cohort districts to develop, train, and maintain coaches to participate for two or more years
- Create a consistent WY SSIP team through building the requirement into established job duties

The WDE will continue to seek support from technical assistance centers such as National Center of Intensive Instruction (NCII). The WDE currently has a contract with the American Institute for Research (AIR) to deliver DBI training and other relevant MTSS professional development.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

DBI is a systemic method for using data to determine when and how to provide more intensive intervention to students. Teachers use progress monitoring data to evaluate a student's response to interventions and then use that information to determine if moving to the next component is needed. With DBI training, teachers provide individual differentiated instruction to students who fit the Wyoming SiMR population as well as those who may be at risk for reading difficulties once they reach the third grade. The WDE conducts three (3) separate Community of Practices (CoP); Administrator, Practitioner, and Coaching, which stakeholders have identified as the three critical areas of training needed to ensure successful implementation. The established CoPs allow Administrators, Practitioners, and Coaches to be involved in a broader community of practice learning from national experts and their peers. Administrators participate to examine the supports needed for practitioners to maximize the effectiveness of the framework. Coaches are involved in their own CoP to learn from national experts, share experience and increase their capacity and maximize their effectiveness in supporting practitioners. Practitioners learn from experts about the data-based individualization (DBI) process, its essential features and how to deliver intensifying interventions for students with intensive needs, including students with disabilities.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

The implementation of DBI, along with our state's coherent improvement strategies (Intensive Technical Assistance, Universal Technical Assistance, and continued development of state infrastructure/capacity), will result in progress toward the SiMR goal. The purpose of providing administrators and practitioners with professional development on DBI and ongoing differentiated supports is to change building practices and teacher capacity to provide accurate and timely interventions to students in need of intensive and individualized support. The alignment of the SSIP work to the WY MTSS Center ensures that the DBI process does not exist in isolation, instead, it is delivered as part of the larger tiered framework, as a full continuum of intervention supports. A solid multi-tiered system of support will lend itself to successful, effective, and sustainable implementation of DBI.

The established community of practices are designed to create a broad network of support for participants, by providing access to peers who are involved in DBI implementation. The PLC process allows participants to share knowledge and build better practices accelerating professional development across the state. Combining professional development and differentiated supports results in a better understanding of the DBI process and its application, while advancing skills through individualized coaching. This ensures that educators are able to meet the individualized needs of students resulting in improved learning outcomes for those students with the most intensive learning needs, including students with disabilities.

<https://intensiveintervention.org/data-based-individualization/state-stories/wyoming>

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

DBI Implementation Checklist is used to determine the extent to which school personnel are implementing the essential components of school-level implementation of data-based individualization for students who need intensive intervention.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Key items accomplished during the 2021-22 school year include:

- \* Trained 3 additional DBI coaches as part of WDE's internal coaching cadre
- \* Further refined, in collaboration with the target district, the state's implementation model
- \* Expanded students served by DBI through the 8th grade
- \* Selected, trained, and coached 1 additional internal district coach in the target district
- \* Expanded the availability of 6 DBI modules to all educators
- \* Trained an additional 15 teachers through the LMS modules
- \* Aligned DBI with the state's General Supervision Process.
- \* In collaboration with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), launched a statewide DBI Community of Practice (CoP) with 79 participants
- \* Developed and deployed Community of Practices to support administrators and DBI coaches
- \* Fielded 11 statewide coaches from the target district and previous coaching participants to support the CoP
- \* Aligned DBI efforts for inclusion as the tier III process for the new statewide WYMTSS center
- \* Fielded a State-Level Coaching Cadre to support practitioners and administrators participating in the statewide Community of Practices
- \* Conducted 3 trainings with two districts new to implementation
- \* Continued collaboration with UW and PTSSB to provide PD to in-service teachers and incorporate DBI into pre-service teacher curriculum

The WYSSIP team had worked collaboratively with the targeted district leadership and CDC administrators to refine its staged implementation process. Two additional districts were identified to begin the DBI training process for the 2020-21 school year. However, due to the uncertainty around COVID-19 closures, both identified districts asked to postpone their involvement in the process. Despite this setback in scale-up, WDE continued to provide teaming process trainings to interested buildings within the target district to support Building Intervention Teams (BIT). These trainings continued until October 2020 when the target district asked us to stop in-person trainings due to COVID-19 concerns.

The WYSSIP team developed LMS modules, which were completed by July 2020 and available to the target district for field testing in September 2020. The DBI LMS course contains 6 modules supporting the core components of DBI:

- \* Overview of the DBI Process
- \* Selecting and Evaluating Tier II Interventions
- \* Intensifying Valid Tier II Intervention
- \* Selecting a Valid Progress Monitoring Tool
- \* Progress Monitoring and Instructional Goal Setting
- \* Academic and Behavioral Illustration of Application

These modules are designed to be used by staff and educators for initial professional development and as a refresher for educators who are currently implementing. Modules are designed to be short in duration and are developed using adult learning principles (Teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy, 2011). Each module includes a participant workbook complete with engagement activities, implementation resources or tools, glossary of terms, handouts, and list of additional resources. To increase accountability to learning the content, each module ends with the learning quiz. For the 2020-21 school year, 31 educators accessed the LMS course and of those, 15 educators had completed all 6 modules.

In November 2020, WDE entered into a relationship with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) to provide technical assistance to build capacity for implementation of DBI at the local level through conducting a state-wide Community of Practice (CoP) with selected teachers. The intended goal of the CoP is to increase capacity of local educators and implementation of the DBI process for participants and to build a cadre of local coaches to support local implementation of DBI. The CoP ran 12 weeks and included 6, 1-hour virtual sessions, meeting bi-weekly. By drawing on implementers from previous cohorts, WDE was able to field 11 dedicated coaches to support practitioners. Coaches were supported through weekly coaching calls to troubleshoot barriers and celebrate successes. Each of the sessions focused on the core components of DBI:

- \* Building a Student Intensive Intervention Plan
- \* Taxonomy of Intervention Intensity
  - \* Fidelity of Intervention Delivery
  - \* Fidelity to DBI and Assessment
- \* Progress Monitoring Plan
- \* Progress Monitoring Data analysis

Based on lessons learned during previous cohorts, the CoP would be domain agnostic. This means that coaches can support practitioners in academics and/or behavior. Additionally, the grade of students' served would be expanded through the 8th grade. In order to build awareness and support, the CoP was solicited to administrators statewide through two virtual information sessions. The final 79 participants selected were a mixture of special education and general education educators, school psychologists, and district and building level administrators. The number of interested educators demonstrated the need for a continued investment in a statewide Community of Practice and the future development of an administrator level CoP. The CoP officially began in January 2021, and ended with final data collection in April 2021.

In January 2021, WDE contracted with American Institutes for Research (AIR) to develop and deploy a state Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) center to support implementing districts throughout the state. As part of the proposed center, the Division of Special Education Programs is working to align their DBI initiative for inclusion as the tier III process of the state's MTSS framework. This center will similarly follow the DBI implementation model by offering multi-part trainings to selected districts that will be supported through state, regional, and local coaches. The center began offering training to interested districts in April 2021.

The 2020-21 DBI coaching project came to completion in May 2021 with a debriefing meeting for the DBI coaches and participating teachers. The meeting focused on assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the DBI process. Coaches and participating teachers worked collaboratively to refine the process and improve existing documentation used for the implementation of DBI. The WYSSIP team then met to begin planning for the next generation of DBI implementation for the 2021-22 school year and beyond. The discussion was primarily focused on continuous improvement of the process, the identification of a sustainable coaching cohort, the expansion of the implementation model to districts state-wide, and additional considerations provided through the debriefing meeting.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

May 2021 marked the end of WDE's fifth cohort of DBI implementation in nine districts (35 schools, 65 teachers across all five of the cohorts) and two CDCs. Based on lessons learned from the 2020-21 school year, stakeholder meetings with the target district were held in May 2021 and the WYSSIP team scheduled trainings with other interested districts. Utilizing feedback from stakeholders and participants, the Wyoming SSIP Team determined changes or refinements to the process for the 2021-22 school year.

In September 2021, the WDE rolled out the 2021-22 cohort of DBI implementers with two new districts. The WDE will continue to provide support to the first through fifth year cohort schools. Previous years' cohort teachers will each mentor an additional special education teacher and general education teachers through a train-the-trainer model. In addition to broadening the cadre of DBI implementers in the 35 schools from the first through fifth cohorts, WDE continues to solicit other districts interested in pursuing DBI professional development. WDE continues to draw on existing district coaches to function as state coaches to support the continued rollout of an expanded Community of Practice framework.

Expanding into other districts will be supported by the designated MTSS state and district coaches. 2021-22 cohort participants will complete the following activities:

- \* Rollout of DBI professional development modules statewide
- \* Development of an administrator Community of Practice
- \* Coaches training for identified district coaches
- \* DBI CoP cohort to include new teachers and LEAs
- \* Annual leadership conference presentations and data share-outs
- \* Universal PD/TA around DBI and Best Practices in Literacy using the state Learning Management System (LMS)

The SSIP evaluation plan for the 2021-22 cohort will replicate the current DBI evaluation plan, with additional emphases in these areas:

- \* Increased number of students
- \* Increased number of teachers trained in the DBI process
- \* Additional collection of student-level data
- \* Ongoing verification of implementation fidelity
- \* Effectiveness of coaching
- \* Relationship between DBI daily or weekly data points and mastery of IEP goals

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

- \* Incorporate and support the Framework as part of the WYMTSS Center
  - \* Develop a cadre of trainers across the state located within their LEA
- \* Obtain commitment from future cohort districts to develop, train, and maintain coaches to participate for two or more years
- \* Create a consistent WY SSIP team through building the requirement into established job duties

The WDE will continue to seek support from technical assistance centers such as National Center of Intensive Instruction (NCII). The WDE currently has a contract with the American Institute for Research (AIR) to deliver DBI training and other relevant MTSS professional development.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**



## **Description of Stakeholder Input**

Over the course of a year, WY took a multi-phase approach to solicit meaningful feedback from a broad group of stakeholders. In the fall of 2020, the WDE embarked on the "Setting the Stage" phase with stakeholders. The goal was to introduce the State Performance Plan (SPP), the individual indicators, and their meaning. The message was given that the SPP measures child and family outcomes, as well as measures compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. The State felt that it would be a disservice to the target setting process if stakeholders, including parents and the public, were not fully informed on the spirit and intent of the IDEA and how the SPP is a crucial tool in driving State and local efforts in special education. This informative message was delivered in a couple of different ways. The WDE holds virtual special education data meetings with every LEA every year. During these meetings, the WDE took the time to review the SPP indicators and provide an explanation of the purpose of each indicator, the discrete measurement, and how it relates to student/family outcomes. This was done with the 48 K-12 LEAs, the Behavioral Health Division which oversees the 14 Regions who deliver Part B services to the Pre-K population in Wyoming, the Wyoming Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (WAPSD), the Wyoming Association of Special Education Administrators (WASEA), and the Parent Information Center. In addition, a 90 minute presentation was delivered through the Wyoming Academic Vision for Excellence Symposium (WAVES), which was open to everyone. WAVES is a statewide system for disseminating important information and professional development.

The next phase was "Where Are We?" which was essentially the State of the State in special education. This phase entailed several months of sharing Wyoming's data and broadly telling our historical data story and current status. In-person and virtual meetings were conducted with all the aforementioned groups, as well as a large "Data Drilldown"; an all-day event which included parents, K-12 staff and administrators, preschool staff and administrators, university staff, parent advocates, parent attorneys, and WDE staff across various divisions. There were a total of 57 people in attendance, 10 of whom were parents. This event was implemented by two external facilitators. A variety of reports were presented for each indicator and were disaggregated by race/ethnicity, disability category, age, environment, etc. Probing questions and activities were presented to examine a root cause analysis for each indicator. There was an opportunity to view data trends through a five-year, historical data report for each of the SPP indicators.

Following the "Where Are We" phase, the WDE initiated the actual target setting meetings with a broad group of stakeholders. In the initial stakeholder meetings for a given indicator, stakeholders reviewed the historical data and the projections for where the State would be in 2025-26 if all things stayed the same. Stakeholders were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Stakeholders were told that they would be selecting the end target (2025-26) for a given indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, then small increments, and then the largest increment from 2024-25 to 2025-26. The purpose of using small increments at the beginning and large increments at the end is to allow enough time for district and school staff members to implement new initiatives and to change practices so that they have an opportunity to realistically meet the intervening targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview in the initial stakeholder meetings, the stakeholders then suggested a challenging and yet achievable target for the 2025-26 school year. The State then selected a target and calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the group, as well as additional stakeholders and the public, to get final approval for all the targets.

The final phase, "Public Reporting", is further explained in a subsequent section of this introduction. Honoring the input of the stakeholders involved, revisions to State targets were made as a result of this process.

The WDE looked at all communication outlets it has with anyone outside the agency. Therefore, the following were contacted to invite representation: parents (including parents from the Wind River Indian Reservation), parent advocates, parent attorneys, parents who have filed state complaints or requested mediation, special education administrators, teachers, related service providers, case managers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, the Behavioral Health Division, Child Development Center administrators and staff, and cross-division State Department staff. There were specific recruitment efforts made (one-on-one phone calls) to purposefully solicit Special Education Administrators for specific reasons. The WDE wanted two administrators from very small, rural districts, two from medium sized districts, two from large districts, and two districts from the Wind River Indian Reservation. Additionally, multiple email listservs and mass-emailings were used.

Finally, to further engage the public in providing input, the WDE deployed two Facebook blasts with an explanation of the purpose and importance of involvement, and links to get background information and provide feedback on each of the SPP indicators. An individual could respond to all indicators or the one(s) they feel most compelled to do so. The ability to engage in the process and provide input was located on The Wyoming Department of Education website (<https://edu.wyoming.gov/for-district-leadership/special-programs/stakeholder-input/>). Each Facebook blast reached approximately 26,527 people across our State.

The stakeholder input process, from beginning to end, included Indicator 17. Therefore, there was not a separate process.

### **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

All current activities have been described. Any changes to the current implementation model or activities will be decided at the WYSSIP team and stakeholders at the annual WYSSIP meeting to be held in April 2022.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

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

The WDE has made publicly available the 2019-20 SSIP, which can be found here: <https://wyominginstructionalnetwork.com/idea-special-education-resources/idea/indicators-osep/2019-20-ssip/>

### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **17 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

### **17 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

## **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:**

Part B Data Manager

#### **Email:**

susan.shipley@wyo.gov

#### **Phone:**

3077772925

#### **Submitted on:**

04/27/22 3:44:34 PM