

KS Part B

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

286

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 Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA, 2004) expanded the accountability requirements of the state education agency (SEA) and districts in the areas of compliance with the law; performance of students with exceptionalities; and the timely, accurate, and reliable reporting of data. As a result of the Reauthorization of IDEIA, 2004, increased accountability at the state and local level, and changes in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP) monitoring priorities, Kansas shifted from a Focused Monitoring System to the Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS). The KIAS is in alignment with IDEIA (2004) general supervision requirements, Results Driven Accountability (RDA) as outlined by the OSEP, Elementary Secondary Education Act and state statutes. The KIAS is an integrated continuous process involving data collection, data verification, district corrective action, reporting and incentives and sanctions. The KIAS includes the following components of General Supervision: performance reports; fiscal management; integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities; effective policies and procedures; data on processes and results; improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions; resolution; targeted technical assistance and professional development. The KIAS is designed to ensure both state and district compliance with the federal special education requirements and improved academic results for students with disabilities.

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

Technical Assistance System:

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

The mechanism that Kansas has in place to ensure the timely delivery of statewide high quality, evidenced-based technical assistance and support to districts is the Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN). The TASN providers include staff from KSDE Early Childhood, Special Education, and Title Services Team (ECSETS), IDEIA Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC), State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), contractual partners, as well as field-based staff. The TASN is a dynamic system of delivery that supports KSDE identified initiatives and priorities that cut across technical assistance, professional learning, accountability, monitoring, governance, and quality standards aligned with the Kansas SPP/APR. The KSDE ECSETS leadership team provides oversight of TASN ensuring timely and quality technical assistance. All technical assistance and professional learning provided by TASN is directed by standard operating principles. The principles include the implementation science and the Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning with a focus on scaling-up of effective implementation of evidence-based practices by districts to improve the educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

Multiple funding sources assist districts in expanding services, improving educator skills, and providing quality professional development based on needs identified by analysis of statewide data. Federal investments include VI-B funds, Title I funds, school improvement, and State Personnel Development Grant funding.

More Kansas Technical Assistance System Network information is available at www.ksdetasn.org

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

The mechanisms Kansas has in place to ensure that service providers at the state and local level have the skills to effectively deliver services to improve results for students with disabilities are primarily provided through the Technical Assistance System Network (TASN). The TASN activities are directed by KSDE initiatives including the Kansas SPP/APR with input and feedback from various stakeholder data, and the number of requests for targeted professional development in a specific area of need.

The KSDE ensures the knowledge and skills to scale up capacity of the TASN providers through continuous professional learning opportunities focused on the Learning Forward Professional Learning Standards which incorporate adult learning principles and implementation science. Kansas utilizes the national technical assistance centers and the OSEP for professional development, guidance and collaboration in order to continually educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

The identification of needs and selection of strategies is informed through the use of data in the self correcting feedback loop. Strategies to improve results for students with disabilities are designed using the implementation drivers focused on staff selection, training, coaching and evaluation to ensure effective implementation of evidence-based practices.

Multiple funding sources assist in expanding services, improving educator skills, and providing quality professional development based on needs identified by analysis of statewide data. Federal investments include VI-B, Title I, and State Personnel Development Grant funding.

More TASN information is at www.ksdetasn.org

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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

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

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR was through five established statewide groups. These groups along with KSDE staff met on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection systems, review progress, identify root causes and propose revisions on targets if needed. These groups include: (1) The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) the TASN providers; and (5) the ESEA Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, and higher education.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

Kansas reports annually to the public on the performance of each district on the targets in the Kansas SPP/APR no later than 120 days following the submission of the APR as required by 34 CFR § 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). The FFY 2015 performance of each district on the indicator targets is available to the public at the KSDE website http://datacentral.ksde.org/sped_rpts.aspx. The reports for FFY 2015 were posted on April 15, 2017. A complete copy of the FFY 2015 SPP, APR and other related documents are available at the KSDE website <http://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Early-Childhood-Special-Education-and-Title-Services/Special-Education> <http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=520#APR>. Dissemination of public reports is through direct distribution and notification of availability on the KSDE website through electronic media including listservs to ensure public awareness.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
10/19/2018		

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

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

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

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

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			86.90%	87.10%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	81.00%
Data		85.70%	86.80%	77.14%	84.14%	85.29%	68.83%	73.02%	76.66%	77.77%	76.71%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	82.00%
Data	77.29%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	83.00%	84.00%	85.75%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,520	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,541	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	77.52%	Calculate 

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
3,520	4,541	77.29%	83.00%	77.52%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR
Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The Kansas four-year graduation cohort rate is 77.52%.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has established minimum graduation requirements for all pupils to receive a regular diploma. These requirements are the same for youth with IEPs. The requirements are as follows:

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

overall 21 units of credit

4 units of English Language Arts

3 units of History/Government (i.e. World History, United States History, United States Government, Concepts of Economics, Geography, and Kansas History and Kansas Government)

3 units of Mathematics

3 units of Science

1 unit of Physical Education

6 units of Electives

1 unit of Fine Arts

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.50%	1.46%		2.46%	2.45%	2.44%	2.44%	2.42%	2.42%
Data		1.67%	4.89%	4.82%	4.15%	2.46%	2.35%	2.33%	2.44%	2.49%	2.72%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	2.40%
Data	2.75%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.40%	2.38%	2.32%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

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

- ☒ Option 1
☐ Option 2

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total Number of High School Students with IEPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
441	17,187	2.75%	2.40%	2.57%

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

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

For FFY 2016 Kansas chose the OSEP Option 2 using the same data source and measurement that was used for the FFY 2015 APR submitted in February 2017. The measurement for students with IEPs in Grades 9-12 is a single year dropout rate calculation. The calculation for Kansas is: (Number of Grade 9-12 Special Education Dropouts/Total Grade 9-12 Special Education Enrollment Count)*100. The source of Special Education Dropouts is Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) Table N032. The source of Special Education Enrollment Count is the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) system End of Year Accountability (EOYA) and EXIT data. The KIDS EOYA and EXIT data are the data source for EDEN Dropout Table N032. The dropout calculation for students with IEPs is the same calculation used for all students under ESEA.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

Kansas counts a student as a dropout if the student leaves school and does not enroll in another school or program that culminates in a high school diploma. These students are reported by the LEA as an exiter under the following exit categories that count as a dropout: discontinued schooling, moved within US - not known to be continuing, unknown, transfer to GED completion program, and transfer to a juvenile or adult correctional facility where educational services are not provided. Also, any unresolved exits are counted in dropout category.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			96.50%	97.20%	97.50%	97.80%	98.00%	99.30%	99.30%		98.32%
			Data		97.10%	98.10%	99.36%	98.86%	99.52%	99.35%	98.84%	98.15%		98.43%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			96.50%	97.20%	97.50%	97.80%	98.00%	99.30%	99.30%		98.31%
			Data		97.20%	98.10%	99.17%	98.85%	99.54%	99.35%	98.89%	97.98%		98.43%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	98.32%
		Data	97.78%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	98.31%
		Data	97.74%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.32%	98.32%	98.34%
Math	A ≥ Overall	98.31%	98.31%	98.33%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the past year, numerous meetings have taken place with broad representation of stakeholders to discuss and make decisions regarding Kansas State assessment procedures including setting targets and how to report results. Kansas stakeholders include the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE), Council of Superintendents, curriculum leaders, Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC), SEAC and ESEA advisory councils.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	33,746	32,745	97.78%	98.32%	97.03%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	33,703	32,695	97.74%	98.31%	97.01%

Public Reporting Information

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

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

In accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f), Kansas reports all assessment data for all students (both general education and students receiving special education services) in the same manner so that data are consistent. Kansas information on performance and participation of students with disabilities is located in two places; (1) The Building Report Card <http://ksreportcard.ksde.org/default.aspx>, and (2) The SPP/APR District Report <http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=666>.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			57.10%	64.20%	70.80%	77.20%	82.50%	73.66%	73.66%		15.36%
			Data		57.10%	64.20%	70.00%	72.21%	73.66%	71.64%	72.23%	68.03%		15.36%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			55.70%	64.60%	70.50%	76.40%	82.30%	68.00%	68.00%		10.85%
			Data		52.10%	60.30%	66.18%	66.19%	67.91%	69.60%	67.32%	57.96%		10.85%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	15.36%
		Data	15.39%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	10.85%
		Data	11.61%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	16.96%	18.56%	20.74%
Math	A ≥ Overall	11.75%	12.65%	14.47%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Over the past year, numerous meetings have taken place with broad representation of stakeholders to discuss and make decisions regarding Kansas State assessment procedures including setting targets and how to report results. Kansas stakeholders include the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE), Council of Superintendents, curriculum leaders, Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC), SEAC and ESEA advisory councils.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	32,745	4,650	15.39%	16.96%	14.20%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

In 2016-2017, the all students category measured as college and career ready had a 3.19% reduction from 2015-2016. The reduction for all students with disabilities measured as college and career ready was 1.19%. The percentage reduction for the population of students with disabilities is reflective of the reduction of the state overall.

Kansas has verified that the data are accurate and the department is in the process of researching reasons for those changes.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

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

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	32,695	3,712	11.61%	11.75%	11.35%

Public Reporting Information

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

In accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f), Kansas reports all assessment data for all students (both general education and students receiving special education services) in the same manner so that data are consistent. Kansas information on performance and participation of students with disabilities is located in two places; (1) The Building Report Card <http://ksreportcard.ksde.org/default.aspx>, and (2) The SPP/APR District Report <http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=666>.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.99%	1.79%	1.59%	1.40%	1.20%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
Data		1.00%	0.34%	0.34%	0.34%	0.34%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0.70%
Data	0%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0.70%	0%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Because Kansas used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table, Kansas has revised its baseline and targets. Kansas continues to have ongoing conversations with its stakeholders regarding its baseline, target, and performance on the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report. Kansas will inform stakeholders, including the State Advisory Panel, of this required change to its baseline and targets and solicit feedback.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	286	0%	0%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- ☒ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
☐ The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:
The Kansas definition of significant discrepancy for suspension and expulsion is any district that suspends at least 10 special education students and suspends 5% or more of its special education population for more than 10 days.

Methodology:

10/19/2018

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

The State determines that a district had a significant discrepancy by comparing the suspension/expulsion rates for students with IEPs among districts in the State. The State calculates the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs for each district within the State.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

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

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

There were no districts identified with a significant discrepancy. A review of policies, procedures, and practices was not required.

This written comment is to verify that Kansas' 2016 response to :

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

is N/A.

Kansas has not identified a district with a significant discrepancy and is not required to do the review under 34 CFR §300.170(b). To select an accurate answer the State would need an N/A option.

Prior to submission, this concern was submitted to OSEP through the GRADS360 Discussion Board as well as the Kansas state contact, but it was not resolved.

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

☐ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0.36%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1	1	286	0%	0%	0.35%

Reasons for Slippage

Slippage most likely occurred due to the review of district policies, procedures, and practices in an online application for the first time. Staff usage of the online application resulted in a more thorough and careful review than Kansas has achieved in past reviews.

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

The Kansas definition of significant discrepancy for suspension and expulsion is any district that suspends at least 10 special education students of a given race or ethnicity and suspends 5% or more of students with IEPs of a given race or ethnicity for more than 10 days.

Methodology:

The State determines that a district had a significant discrepancy by comparing the suspension/expulsion rates for students with IEPs among districts in the State. The State calculates the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs for each district within the State.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

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

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

State staff used a new online application to review the district's policies, practices, and procedures on the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. State staff determined that the district's policies, practices, and procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with requirements relating to 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)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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.

The State required the district to draft and implement a corrective action plan designed to remedy the deficient district policy related to procedural safeguards. The State collected updated data to ensure the revised district policy had been revised correctly. The updated data showed that the district policy had been revised to meet requirements relating to procedural safeguards.

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

10/19/2018

Page 16 of 71

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			57.20%	58.00%	58.80%	59.50%	60.00%	62.82%	62.81%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data		59.30%	60.80%	60.50%	62.16%	62.82%	65.06%	65.60%	67.17%	68.61%	69.32%
B	2005	Target ≤			9.60%	9.20%	8.70%	8.20%	8.00%	7.39%	7.39%	7.35%	7.35%
		Data		8.12%	7.90%	7.49%	7.21%	7.39%	7.15%	7.55%	7.21%	6.93%	6.72%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.61%	2.45%	2.30%	2.14%	1.98%	2.00%	2.00%	2.50%	2.50%
		Data		2.44%	2.31%	2.87%	2.71%	2.53%	2.51%	2.41%	2.29%	2.30%	2.27%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	65.00%
	Data	68.91%
B	Target ≤	7.35%
	Data	6.97%
C	Target ≤	2.50%
	Data	2.20%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B ≤	7.34%	7.32%	7.30%
Target C ≤	2.48%	2.46%	2.43%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	60,849	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	41,942	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,507	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,128	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	165	null

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	79	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	41,942	60,849	68.91%	66.00%	68.93%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,507	60,849	6.97%	7.34%	7.41%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,372	60,849	2.20%	2.48%	2.25%

Reasons for B Slippage

Slippage is driven by several factors including transition from day school programs back to neighborhood schools where more intense services are required. Additionally, data and input from stakeholders has indicated that more children are needing intense levels of services and are, therefore, reported in 5B.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									38.91%	38.30%	38.40%
		Data								38.66%	38.91%	38.40%	37.76%
B	2011	Target ≤									31.99%	33.30%	33.21%
		Data								32.24%	32.04%	33.21%	34.04%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	38.50%
	Data	37.23%
B	Target ≤	32.75%
	Data	33.53%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	38.75%	38.91%	39.00%
Target B ≤	32.50%	31.99%	31.75%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	11,437	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	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	4,322	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,976	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	18	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education	4,322	11,437	37.23%	38.75%	37.79%

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

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
and related services in the regular early childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,994	11,437	33.53%	32.50%	34.92%

☐
Use a different calculation methodology

Reasons for B Slippage

Slippage is driven by several factors including limited availability of regular early childhood programs statewide. Additionally, data and input from stakeholders has indicated that more preschool children require intense levels of services and are, therefore, reported in 6B.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						85.93%	86.43%	86.00%	86.00%	86.50%	86.50%
		Data					85.93%	84.52%	86.82%	87.37%	87.74%	88.06%	87.74%
A2	2008	Target ≥						65.16%	65.66%	66.00%	66.00%	66.40%	66.40%
		Data					65.16%	65.66%	65.85%	67.88%	66.47%	66.73%	65.61%
B1	2008	Target ≥						86.38%	86.88%	86.50%	86.50%	86.45%	86.45%
		Data					86.38%	85.38%	86.24%	86.75%	87.68%	87.42%	86.78%
B2	2008	Target ≥						63.60%	64.10%	64.00%	64.00%	63.00%	63.00%
		Data					63.60%	62.65%	63.42%	65.84%	63.94%	63.38%	63.90%
C1	2008	Target ≥						86.24%	86.74%	86.74%	86.74%	87.40%	87.40%
		Data					86.24%	85.84%	86.97%	89.12%	87.66%	88.15%	87.66%
C2	2008	Target ≥						76.79%	77.29%	77.93%	77.97%	78.80%	78.80%
		Data					76.79%	77.93%	78.42%	79.96%	78.90%	79.13%	77.89%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	86.50%
	Data	88.13%
A2	Target ≥	66.40%
	Data	65.52%
B1	Target ≥	86.45%
	Data	87.53%
B2	Target ≥	63.00%
	Data	63.31%
C1	Target ≥	87.40%
	Data	88.61%
C2	Target ≥	78.80%
	Data	77.62%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	86.65%	86.75%	87.00%
Target A2 ≥	66.60%	66.80%	67.00%
Target B1 ≥	86.47%	86.49%	86.50%
Target B2 ≥	63.50%	63.75%	64.00%
Target C1 ≥	87.60%	87.80%	88.00%
Target C2 ≥	79.00%	79.25%	79.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4043.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	8.00	0.20%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	308.00	7.62%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1166.00	28.84%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1504.00	37.20%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1057.00	26.14%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2670.00	2986.00	88.13%	86.65%	89.42%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2561.00	4043.00	65.52%	66.60%	63.34%

Reasons for A2 Slippage

KSDE is in the process of examining a number of factors that may have contributed to the decrease in performance on this target including staff turnover at the local and state level and increased requests for technical assistance with data entry.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	3.00	0.07%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	309.00	7.64%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1233.00	30.50%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1475.00	36.48%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1023.00	25.30%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2708.00	3020.00	87.53%	86.47%	89.67%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2498.00	4043.00	63.31%	63.50%	61.79%

Reasons for B2 Slippage

KSDE is in the process of examining a number of factors that may have contributed to the decrease in performance on this target including staff turnover at the local and state level and increased requests for technical assistance with data entry.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	5.00	0.12%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	282.00	6.98%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	693.00	17.14%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1575.00	38.96%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1488.00	36.80%

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2268.00	2555.00	88.61%	87.60%	88.77%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3063.00	4043.00	77.62%	79.00%	75.76%

Reasons for C2 Slippage

KSDE is in the process of examining a number of factors that may have contributed to the decrease in performance on this target including staff turnover at the local and state level and increased requests for technical assistance with data entry.

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

Was sampling used? No

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

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

Instruments used to gather data for this indicator are:

At least one of the following curriculum-based assessments must be used in conjunction with information obtained through record review, interview, observation, screening, parent input, and additional tests to complete the COSF:

AEPS, Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers/Preschoolers with Special Needs, Child Observation Record, Creative Curriculum (Teaching Strategies Gold), Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP), Individual Growth and Development Indicators (IGDI), Transdisciplinary Play-Based Assessment (TPBA), and Work Sampling System.

Procedures used to gather data for this indicator are:

COSF data are entered into the Outcomes Web System (OWS) application. Automated verification checks were developed within the OWS application to ensure reliable data. These verification checks ensure data entry user accurately completes the content required for each data element at the time of data entry. Targeted training was held across the state to reinforce the use of the decision tree in the rating process and additional information about comparison to typically developing students was provided. Training impact is demonstrated by the actual data showing the districts are rating children with increased inter-rater reliability and thus, have a consistent understanding of the child's functional outcomes compared to typically developing peers.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			37.00%	58.90%	59.20%	59.80%	60.50%	68.00%	68.50%	66.00%	66.00%
Data		33.00%	58.87%	62.20%	62.93%	67.70%	64.08%	68.21%	63.73%	66.58%	73.37%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	66.00%
Data	82.98%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	66.25%	66.40%	66.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1722.00	2417.00	82.98%	66.25%	71.25%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	3.92%	61608.00
---	-------	----------

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

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

The sampling methodology includes ages 3-21. The previously approved OSEP sampling plan and methodology has not changed.

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

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

The representativeness of the parent survey results were assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of children with disabilities in the population.

Seventy-nine percent of parent respondents had a child with a race/ethnicity of white, whereas 65% of children with disabilities are white. Nine percent of parent respondents had a child with a race/ethnicity of Hispanic, whereas 17% of the children with disabilities are Hispanic.

10/19/2018

Page 24 of 71

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

Sixteen percent of parent respondents had a child with a learning disability, whereas 34% of children with disabilities have a learning disability. Eighteen percent of parent respondents had a child with autism, whereas 6% of children with disabilities are identified with autism.

While parents of Hispanic students with disabilities were slightly less likely to respond to the parent survey than parents of white students with disabilities, the results are representative of the state. When examining the items and survey scales, there were no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity. When examining the response rate by local education agency (LEA), parents from a wide variety of LEAs across the state responded to the survey. The analysis of demographic characteristics of the parents who responded are representative of the race/ethnicity, age of student, and disability of the students of parents in the population. Thus, Kansas is confident in the representativeness of the results of the statewide census survey.

Kansas will continue to ensure the response data are representative of the children receiving special education services in the state by extending the survey return window and obtaining stakeholder feedback and input as to the effectiveness of the current delivery method.

Was sampling used? ☒ Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? ☐ No

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

In accordance with the Kansas sampling plan, Kansas conducted a census survey for FFY 2016.

The results are valid and reliable because all parents of children with disabilities in all districts in the state were given the opportunity to complete the survey. Secondly, the representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of the entire sample. This comparison indicates the results are representative by race/ethnicity, age of student, and disability.

Was a survey used? ☒ Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? ☐ No

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0.68%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 127

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	159	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

A district is identified as having disproportionate representation if that district meets the following two-year criteria for racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Year 1-

Overrepresentation – The district must have:

- At least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group in the district;
- At least 10 students of a racial and ethnic group in special education and related services;
- At least 10 students in the comparison group; and
- A weighted risk ratio >3.00.

Year 2 –

Overrepresentation - The district must have:

- At least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group in the district;
- At least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group in special education and related services
- At least 30 students in the comparison group; and
- A weighted risk ratio >3.00.

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

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) provides each district with a final risk ratio for overrepresentation. If a district has a weighted risk ratio >3.00, the following is implemented:

Year 1 –

- KSDE team reviews the submitted information and verifies the year one data calculation.

Year 2 –

- KSDE team verifies the year two data calculation and identifies the district as having disproportionate representation accordingly.
- District completes and submits the required Kansas Self-Assessment Tool: Review district policies, practices and procedures specific to the identified race and ethnic group to determine if the identified IDEIA practices occur.
- KSDE team reviews submitted information to determine whether the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

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.

No disproportionate representation was identified.

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

Notes on Calculation Method: Westat's technical guidance notes: "When risk ratios are based on small numbers, minor variations in the number of students in either the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group can produce dramatic changes in the size of the risk ratio. Furthermore, it is impossible to calculate risk ratios if there are no students in the comparison group (i.e. the risk for the comparison group cannot be calculated) or if none of the students in the comparison group receives special education and related services." While Kansas has two large urban centers with large minority populations, it also has a large number of very small districts (the district median size is only 560 students). This results in fairly frequent cases where the non-White groups are very small or missing entirely. It also means there are districts where there are just two sizable ethnic groups. These are the very conditions that Westat's technical guidance warns will produce unreliable or distorted weighted risk ratios. Due to these issues, Kansas uses the following process to calculate a "final" risk ratio which is either a weighted risk ratio or risk ratio. In order to calculate a final risk ratio, a district must have:

- at least 30 students of a race/ethnicity;
- at least 10 students of a specific race/ethnicity in special education and related services;
- a minimum of 10 special education students in the comparison group. If the comparison group does not have students with disabilities students in a "prominent" racial/ethnic group (Hispanics, Blacks, or Whites), the risk ratio is used. When a weighted risk ratio is used in these conditions, the weighted risk ratio often has a very extreme value which is purely a function of the "large" weighting of the small numbers of students in the prominent racial/ethnic groups.

If the comparison group has at least one special education student in each of the prominent racial/ethnic groups, then a weighted risk ratio is used. See above measurement box for methodology for identifying districts as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

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

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0.70%	0.68%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 198

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	88	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

The following criteria will determine if a district is potentially identified for Disproportionate Representation for two consecutive years for a racial and ethnic group and disability category.

Year 1 -

Overrepresentation – The district must have:

- At least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group in the district;
- At least 10 students of a racial and ethnic group in a specific disability category;
- At least 10 students in the comparison group; and
- A weighted risk ratio >3.00

Year 2 –

Overrepresentation - The district must have:

- At least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group in the district;
- At least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group in a specific disability category;

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

- At least 30 students in the comparison group; and
- A weighted risk ratio >3.00

Methodology

Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) provides each district with a final risk ratio for overrepresentation. If a district has a weighted risk ratio >3.00, the following requirements will be implemented:

Year 1 –

- KSDE team reviews the submitted information and verifies the year one data calculation.

Year 2 –

- KSDE team verifies the year two data calculation and identifies the district as having disproportionate representation accordingly.
- District completes and submits the required Kansas Self-Assessment Tool: Review district policies, practices and procedures specific to the identified racial and ethnic group and disability category to determine if the identified IDEIA practices occur.
- KSDE team reviews submitted information to determine whether the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

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.

No disproportionate representation was identified.

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

Notes on Calculation Method: Westat's technical guidance notes: "When risk ratios are based on small numbers, minor variations in the number of students in either the racial/ethnic group or the comparison group can produce dramatic changes in the size of the risk ratio. Furthermore, it is impossible to calculate risk ratios if there are no students in the comparison group (i.e. the risk for the comparison group cannot be calculated) or if none of the students in the comparison group receives special education and related services." While Kansas has two large urban centers with large minority populations, it also has a large number of very small districts (the district median size is only 560 students). This results in fairly frequent cases where the non-White groups are very small or missing entirely. It also means there are districts where there are just two sizable ethnic groups. These are the very conditions that Westat's technical guidance warns will produce unreliable or distorted weighted risk ratios. Due to these issues, Kansas uses the following process to calculate a "final" risk ratio which is either a weighted risk ratio or risk ratio. In order to calculate a final risk ratio, a district must have:

- at least 30 students of a race/ethnicity;
- at least 10 students of a specific race/ethnicity in special education and related services;
- a minimum of 10 special education students in the comparison group

If the comparison group does not have students with disabilities students in a "prominent" racial/ethnic group (Hispanics, Blacks, or Whites), the risk ratio is used. When a weighted risk ratio is used in these conditions, the weighted risk ratio often has a very extreme value which is purely a function of the "large" weighting of the small numbers of students in the prominent racial/ethnic groups. If the comparison group has at least one special education student in each of the prominent racial/ethnic groups, then a weighted risk ratio is used. See above measurement box for methodology for identifying districts as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

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

	Corrected Within One Year	Corrected	
null	null	null	0

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		98.40%	97.10%	100%	98.83%	98.72%	99.53%	99.59%	99.77%	99.77%	99.58%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.86%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,676	2,669	99.86%	100%	99.74%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	7
---	---

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.

Range of Days:
1-70

Reasons for delays:
Difficulty scheduling meeting

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

- What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- ☐ State monitoring
 - ☒ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) collects Eligible and Not Eligible Initial Evaluations in an authenticated database system. The districts were required to report the actual number of days for each Initial Evaluation in the random sample. If the Initial Evaluation extended beyond the state definition of the 60-day timeline, the district was required to report a reason the Initial Evaluation went beyond the 60 day timeline. KAR 91-40-8(f) defines the 60-day timeline as 60 school days from the date the agency receives written

10/19/2018

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

parental consent for evaluation of a child. During the 60 school days, the district must conduct the evaluation of the child and conduct a meeting to determine whether the child is a child with a disability.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All noncompliance for FFY 2015 was corrected and corrections verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. Based on review of updated student file data submitted, the KSDE has verified that each district with noncompliance reported under this indicator has achieved 100% compliance on updated data consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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

All noncompliance for FFY 2015 was corrected and corrections verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. Based on review of data in an authenticated database system, the KSDE has verified that each district with noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2015 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and had developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom the implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09- 02.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		72.00%	97.28%	99.52%	99.55%	98.64%	99.30%	99.88%	99.56%	99.20%	99.89%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.85%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,899
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	368
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,090
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	384
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	47
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e-f)]x100	2,090	2,100	99.85%	100%	99.52%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	10
--	----

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.

Range of days beyond the third birthday: 1-108 days.

Reasons for delays: Staff Error.

- What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- ☒ State monitoring
 - ☐ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) collects transition data from Part C to Part B in an authenticated database system. The districts were required to verify that the IEP was in place by the child's third birthday. If the IEP extended past the third birthday the

10/19/2018Page 34 of 71

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

district was required to state reasons for the delay. KSDE reviews the reasons and determines if the criteria for the exception category is met or if the action was completed even though late.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All noncompliance for FFY 2015 was corrected and corrections verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. Based on review of updated student file data submitted on children transitioning from Part C to Part B, the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has verified that each district with noncompliance reported under this indicator is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, 34 CFR § 300.124(b), and has achieved 100% compliance on updated data consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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

All noncompliance for FFY 2015 was corrected and corrections verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. Based on review of data in an authenticated database system on children transitioning from Part C to Part B, the KSDE has verified that each district with noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2015 APR has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

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

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						99.84%	99.11%	99.36%	96.24%	97.51%	99.73%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.74%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,519	2,536	99.74%	100%	99.33%

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

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

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

The KSDE uses the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Secondary Transition Checklist to collect data in an authenticated database system.

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? ☒ Yes ☐ No

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States may, but are not required to, include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. Kansas is not including data from youth younger than 16.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

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

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2015 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has verified based on a review of updated data in an authenticated database system that each district (including juvenile and adult correction facilities, and state schools) with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2015 data reported for this indicator is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), and has achieved 100% compliance consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2015 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has verified through a review of data submitted in an authenticated database system that each district (including juvenile and adult correction facilities and state schools) with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2015 data reported for this indicator has corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district or LEA consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							49.00%	50.00%	50.00%	33.00%	35.50%
		Data						48.60%	45.61%	31.15%	32.10%	33.33%	36.43%
B	2009	Target ≥							73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	60.60%	61.60%
		Data						72.60%	67.98%	53.01%	58.85%	60.61%	63.93%
C	2009	Target ≥							83.50%	84.00%	84.00%	73.59%	74.59%
		Data						83.20%	87.28%	69.40%	73.25%	73.59%	77.14%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	38.00%
	Data	28.25%
B	Target ≥	63.20%
	Data	54.25%
C	Target ≥	76.59%
	Data	67.75%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	41.00%	45.00%	48.65%
Target B ≥	65.60%	69.60%	72.65%
Target C ≥	79.09%	81.09%	83.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	307.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	131.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	60.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	7.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	26.00

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

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

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	131.00	307.00	28.25%	41.00%	42.67%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	191.00	307.00	54.25%	65.60%	62.21%
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)	224.00	307.00	67.75%	79.09%	72.96%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

Data collection for this indicator currently is based on a representative sample of districts across the state.

Kansas districts are categorized into three groups for sampling purposes for Indicator 14. Districts were assigned to the three groups using a stratified random sampling method. Each of the three groups was representative of the entire state in terms of school district size, race/ethnicity rates, free/reduced lunch, special education disability categories, and geographic areas. In addition to statistical information and geography, the degree to which the districts might differ in a systematic, nonstatistical way that potentially could impact student post-secondary outcomes was considered.

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

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The design of the sampling methodology will yield valid and reliable estimates because Kansas districts are categorized into three cohorts using a stratified random sampling method. Each cohort is representative in terms of size, race, ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, disability and geographical location. The cohort surveyed each year is inclusive of all eligible exiters from the districts within each cohort. Kansas will consider the use of strategies to ensure the response data continue to be representative of exiting students by investigating having district staff make calls to the exiters and emailing a survey link to non-respondents to increase the response rate. Kansas is intent on improving the overall response rate.

The representativeness of the Indicator 14 results was analyzed by examining the demographic characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of exiter to determine if one group was more likely to respond than another group. This analysis showed that white (32%) exiters were significantly more likely to respond than Hispanic (13%) exiters. In addition, exiters who dropped out (9%) were significantly less likely to respond than exiters who graduated with a diploma (31%). Even though differences in response rates exist, Kansas is confident the results are generally representative of the state for three reasons. First, there were no significant differences by gender or by primary disability. Second, exiters who responded were geographically representative of districts across the state. Third, responses of Hispanic exiters were not significantly different from responses of white exiters.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005			2006			2007			2008		
Target			-		35.20%	-	35.20%	35.40%	-	35.40%	35.60%	-	35.60%
Data		35.00%			75.00%			42.10%			40.00%		

FFY	2009			2010			2011			2012		
Target	35.80%	-	35.80%	35.80%	-	35.80%	37.00%	-	40.00%	37.00%	-	40.00%
Data	60.00%			80.00%			66.67%			85.71%		

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Target	37.00%	-	40.00%	37.00%	-	40.00%	37.00%	-	40.00%
Data	40.00%			50.00%			60.00%		

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	37.00%	-	40.00%	37.00%	-	40.00%	37.00%	-	40.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	4	60.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	75.00%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than 10 resolution sessions held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to meet its target until 10 or more resolution sessions are held.

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

none

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005			2006			2007			2008		
Target			-		76.00%	-	76.00%	77.00%	-	77.00%	78.00%	-	78.00%
Data		88.00%			82.00%			73.10%			78.30%		

FFY	2009			2010			2011			2012		
Target	79.00%	-	79.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%
Data	82.35%			80.95%			77.78%			66.67%		

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Target	76.94%	-	76.94%	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%
Data	75.00%			80.00%			70.00%		

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%	77.00%	-	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the proposed targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	11	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	16	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	11	16	70.00%	70.00% - 80.00%	87.50%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		29.95%	30.00%	32.50%
Data	29.95%	24.41%	26.37%	27.52%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	28.50%	29.50%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Revised Baseline and Targets:

The revised baseline and targets (see Table 2) were set using the recently adopted CBM-GOM assessments and the complete Kansas SIMR cohort for the FFY 2016 SSIP reporting cycle. Stakeholders initiated these changes from within districts with additional stakeholder involvement of regional implementation teams, the KSDE State Performance Plan (SPP) committee, SSIP workgroup, and the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC).

Data from the SIMR cohort districts demonstrating student-level improvement led to the decision to maintain the current improvement strategies and change only the targets of the Kansas SSIP. The Kansas SIMR data has shown consistent improvements over the years, despite concurrently adding new cohort districts, depressing the overall SIMR data. FFY 2017 will be the first year that all SIMR cohort districts are anticipated to be at full implementation.

Table 2

Revised Baseline and Targets.

Baseline FFY 2016	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2018 Target
27.52%	28.50%	29.50%

For students to reach grade-level benchmark on a CBM-GOM, both 95% accuracy and fluency consistent with the grade-level criteria must be achieved. When students are struggling to learn to read, initial intervention focuses on improvement in accuracy and then shifts to improvement in fluency, which allows the students to achieve benchmark. In FFY 2016, the percentage of students with disabilities in grades K-5 who achieved the 95% accuracy criteria improved from 32% to 60%. Developing interventions focused on student need resulted in individual student growth and is expected to be reflected in the FFY 2017 and 2018 SIMR data. With both the improvements in Kansas SIMR data and more discreet student-level data, stakeholders determined the intervention to be effective, requiring only an adjustment of targets.

On September 27, 2017, the KSDE Early Childhood, Special Education, and Title Services (ECSETS) team, Indicator 17 workgroup, convened a call with Leticia Braga, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) contact for Kansas, to discuss the adjustments to the baseline, targets, and SIMR statement. The OSEP and KSDE staff agreed that the process for determining the adjustments was based on sound data and stakeholder input.

Description of Measure

Through the implementation of the Kansas State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Kansas intends to achieve the following State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR): The percentage of students with disabilities who score at grade level benchmark on General Outcome Measure (GOM) reading assessment for grades Kindergarten through 5th in the targeted buildings will increase to 29.50% by 2018. Baseline was re-established using data from the SIMR cohort. GOM provides a child-level outcome measure that is aligned, complementary and predictive of achievement on the Kansas State Assessment. The measurement is the percentage of students with disabilities in Kindergarten through 5th grades who score at benchmark on the reading GOM. The baseline and targets are set as a percentage across grade levels. Annual targets are set in

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

consideration of the implementation science knowledge base, including the implementation dip, with the realization that each year scaling up will increase the variance of intervention reflected in the reported data.

The identified SIMR provides an appropriate measure for the Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies of program alignment and implementation of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. The alignment of policies, and practices within KSDE will increase integrated service delivery and support statewide implementation of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. The Kansas Integrated Framework is a comprehensive multi-tiered system of instruction, supports and interventions to meet the academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs of students.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Multiple external stakeholders from the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Families Together, Inc. which is the Kansas Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC), Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS), Kansas Learning Network (KLN), the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) Advisory Council and the regional resource center state liaison for Kansas were engaged in the process of establishing the proposed State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR), baseline and yearly targets. In addition, multiple internal stakeholders from the KSDE Office of the Commissioner, Division of Learning Services (DLS), Early Childhood, Special Education, and Title Services (ECSETS) team were engaged in the process of establishing the proposed State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR), baseline and yearly targets. Stakeholders represented persons with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, teachers, principals, superintendents, higher education faculty, state school staff, correctional facilities, vocational rehabilitation representative, and other state agency representatives. Internal and external stakeholders were engaged in discussions, submissions of verbal and/or written input, and document reviews of the Kansas SSIP baseline and targets.

Overview

The Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) is committed to system wide improvement from the classroom through district-level for the purpose of achieving the Kansas State Board of Education's (KSBE) vision: Kansas leads the world in the success of each student. Kansas is implementing standards that address rigor and include skills needed to prepare each student for success in college and careers. Implementation of the Kansas State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is aligned with the KSBE vision and the KSBE maintains a commitment that students with disabilities are students first, and can make gains in achievement when provided quality instruction informed by data. In order for students with disabilities to meet and exceed academic expectations for grade level, Kansas is building district wide capacity by training teachers in the use of evidence-based practices which include the provision of an evidence-based core curriculum and interventions, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement. As a result, Kansas expects to achieve the ambitious State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR): The percentage of students with disabilities who score at grade level benchmark on General Outcome Measure (GOM), reading assessment for grades Kindergarten through 5th in targeted buildings will increase to 29.50% by 2018. The rigorous coherent improvement strategies contained within the Kansas SSIP are as follows:

1.0 Current State Education Agency (SEA) policies, organization and infrastructure will be strategically realigned to allocate and leverage the State Education Agency (SEA) supports for increasing district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities;

2.0 Design, implement and evaluate an integrated school improvement planning framework to increase district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities; and

3.0 Evaluate the degree to which the state infrastructure supports district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th grade.

The coherent improvement strategies are designed to improve reading instruction measured by the SIMR. The Kansas MTSS SIMR cohort is a subset of the full scale Kansas MTSS improvement efforts being made across 189 of the 286 Kansas districts. The Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework is the term used to describe the system that district and school teams develop and operationalize to provide supports for every child to be successful, including the processes and tools used to make data-based decisions. The focus of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework is system-level change across the classroom, school, district and state. The word "integrated" in the title is used to emphasize the commitment to include social emotional and behavioral instruction simultaneously with academics. Foundational structures and leveraging connections from previous evidenced-based technical assistance initiatives is critical for sustainability and development of the Kansas SSIP.

The FFY 2016 Kansas Phase III, Year 2 Report includes data and analysis, consistent with the Kansas State Systemic Improvement Plan Indicator 17 evaluation plan, to the extent Kansas has made progress toward short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the Kansas SSIP as outlined in the State Phase III, Year 2 Report Organizational Outline. The FFY 2016 Kansas Phase III, Year 2 Report also includes progress Kansas has made in achieving the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for students with disabilities, data based justifications for changes in implementation activities; data to support that Kansas is on the right path, and descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved in decision-making. The Kansas Phase III, Year 2 report pdf is attached below and labeled as FFY 2016 Kansas Phase III, Year 2 Report.

Data Analysis

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

A comprehensive process was used to identify, select, and analyze key existing data (including data from the SPP/APR, 618 data collections in addition to numerous other data sources). The data analysis process was led by a KSDE workgroup formed to guide the development of the SSIP. This internal leadership team was comprised of stakeholders internal and external to the SEA, including the KSDE School Improvement Coordinator, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver Coordinator/Assistant Director, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services (ECSETS) Team Director and Assistant Director, KSDE Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) staff and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Project Director. This team continually engaged additional external stakeholders including the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the regional resource center state liaison for Kansas throughout the process to validate interpretations and to provide input for focused data analysis. This broad set of external stakeholders included technical assistance providers, SPDG Evaluators, state parent training information center (Families Together, Inc.) staff, Kansas Parent Information Center (KPIRC) staff, KSDE Board of Education (KSBE), Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members, local special education administrators, the Kansas Learning Network (KLN), General Supervision, Timely and Accurate Data (GSTAD) and the Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) project staff.

The broad and focused data analysis process occurred with multiple opportunities for stakeholder input ensuring accurate and representative data analysis. The entire data analysis process was conducted within an established “plan-do-study-act” cycle of continuous improvement. The discussions occurred across time, settings and participants with the SSIP workgroup members supplying the data and using convergence of data to inform decision-making, as well as, to guide additional data analysis. Data were considered to be high quality due to KSDE Data Quality Assurance policies which include training and data certification of district staff and oversight provided by the KSDE TASN evaluation team.

Broad Level Analysis

The broad level of analysis comparing Kansas data to US data was conducted during the Summer of 2014 (i.e., prevalence data sources and educational environment data sources). A set of Kansas Data Display tables served as the guide for conducting the analyses. The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate was used in the analysis of graduation rates. The KSDE Licensed Personnel Report was used in the analysis of “highly qualified” educators (general education and special education). Each of the SPP/APR Results and Compliance Indicators were analyzed using a longitudinal comparison of the state’s performance against the indicator target. As part of the broad data analysis, subsets of data categories (a focused analysis integrated into the broader level of analysis) of State data relating to race/ethnicity, graduation rate, state assessment, and quality personnel also were examined.

Data sources used in the broad analysis were as follows:

- Prevalence Data Sources: FFY 2012 IDEAdata.org Child Count and FFY 2012 Elementary and Secondary Information System (ELSI) Gen Ed Count.
- Educational Environments Data Sources: FFY 2012 IDEAdata.org Child Count, and Educational Environment files.
- Race Ethnicity Data Sources: FFY 2012 IDEAdata.org Child Count, and Educational Environment files.
- Graduation Rate Data Sources: FFY 2011 EDEN Table N 150.
- State Assessment Data Sources: FFY 2012 EDEN Tables N 175, 178, 185, and 188.
- Quality Personnel Data Sources: FFY 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 KSDE Licensed Personnel Report.
- SPP/APR Indicator Data Sources: FFY 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 state level data reported in the APR.

The results of the broad data analysis in the seven data sources are explained below:

State level disability prevalence. No significant differences were found between the percent of FFY 2012 3-5 and 6-21 year old Kansas students with disabilities and the FFY 2012 3-5 and 6-21 year old students with disabilities in the United States (US). Difference was found between Kansas and US Percent of Students within Disability Categories, specifically the Kansas percentage of Developmental Delay (56.12%) as compared with national average (37.22%). Even though the percentage of Developmental Delay in Kansas was greater than the percentage of Developmental Delay in US, not every state used the Developmental Delay category and Kansas had a definition that was different than other states for Developmental Delay. Therefore, a valid comparison could not be made.

State level educational environments. A difference was found between Kansas and US Percent of Students within Educational Environment Categories, specifically Kansas 3-5 year olds were found in a less restrictive environment more frequently than the US 3-5 year olds; yet, a greater percent of Kansas students with Developmental Delay and Speech-Language needs were in separate and other locations than across the US. In general, Kansas 6-21 year olds were found in Less Restrictive Educational Environments more frequently when compared to US 6-21 year olds. However, there were fewer students with Speech -Language needs in the Regular Class 80% Educational Environments than those found across the US.

State level race/ethnicity. There were three sub categories of data analyses for state level race/ethnicity for students with disabilities, including; (a) the percent of students within disability categories, (b) percent of students within educational environment

categories, and (c) percent of students age 3-21 years old with total disciplinary removals. The description of data analyses for each of the sub categories are provided below:


1. Differences were found between **Kansas Race/Ethnicities Percent of Students within Disability Categories**. The vast majority of 3-5 year olds were found in the Developmental Delay (ranging from 53.24% for White to 71.07% for American Indian) and Speech-Language (ranging from 23.37% for Asian to 39.31% for White) categories. The vast majority of students with disabilities from 6-21 year olds were found in the category of Learning Disabilities (ranging from 32.91% for Asian to 54.02% for American Indian) and Speech-Language (ranging from 8.08% for Black to 24.27% for Asian) categories. The percent of 6-21 year old Asian students in Speech-Language was 7.37% greater than the next highest race/ethnicity category (White).
2. Differences were found between **Kansas Race/Ethnicities Percent of Students within Educational Environment Categories**. The majority of 3-5 year old American Indian (36.36%), Hawaiian (35.29%), and White (32.82%) students were found in the Separate Class Category of Educational Environments while the second greatest percentage of 3-5 year old American Indian (23.14%), Hawaiian (29.41%), and White (28.16%) students were found in Regular Early Childhood for at least 10 hours Education Environment Category. An almost equal percentage of Hispanic students were found in the Regular Early Childhood category for at least 10 hours per day and the Separate Class category of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) than those found across the US. In general, Kansas 6-21 year olds were found in a less restrictive environment more frequently when compared to the US students who are 6-21 years old. Fewer Speech-Language students were in the Regular Class 80% environment.
3. Differences were found between **Kansas Race/Ethnicities Percent of Students ages 3-21 Years Old with Total Disciplinary Removals**. Students within the Black Race/Ethnicity Category (.61%) have the highest percent of Total Disciplinary Removals as compared with Hawaiian (.34%), two or more (.34%), American Indian (.27%), Hispanic (.26%), White (.16%), Asian (.09%), and all ethnicities (.23%).

State level graduation rates. Differences were found between Graduation Rates for Kansas Race/Ethnicities. The percentage of all Asians, two or more race/ethnicities, Whites and All Students were above the 80% target for students who graduated from within the four-year graduation cohort on time. The percentage of all Hawaiians (62.26%), Blacks (73.88%), American Indians (74.35%) and Hispanics (75.23%), was below the 80% target. The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged (75.03%), Limited English Proficient (73.10%) and Students with Disabilities (76.66%) was below the 80% target.


State assessments. FFY 2012 Kansas State Assessment Data (both statewide and alternate assessments) was analyzed by; (a) student participation rate for all student groups, and (b) student proficiency rates for all students in reading and math for FFY 2012 for all student groups. State assessment data was not available for FFY 2013.

Participation Rates. An analysis for the participation rates revealed only slight differences between Kansas Race/Ethnicities and Status Group Participation Rates exist. In reading for FFY 2012 categories were near or exceeded the Annual Measureable Objective (AMO) participation rate goal of 95%. Migrant participation was 82.96%. In Math all Race/Ethnicities met or exceeded the AMO participation rate of 95%.

Reading Proficiency. An analysis for proficiency rates for all student groups was represented. Reading Proficiency showed 8 of the 14 categories were near or exceeded the AMO Reading proficiency rate goal of 73.66% in Reading. Data revealed Black students (65.75%), Students with Disabilities (68.03%), Hispanic (73.14%), Limited English Proficient (65.95%), Migrant (61.16%), and Homeless (67.53%) proficiency rates were below the SPP/APR Target. See attached Figure 2.



Math Proficiency. FFY 2012 Math proficiency data revealed 8 of the 14 subgroups met or exceeded the SPP/APR Math proficiency rate target of 68.00%. Black (56.52%), Hispanic (65.75%), Students with Disabilities (57.96%), Limited English Proficient (60.79%), Migrant (53.01%), and Homeless (58.15%) proficiency rates were lower than rates of other groups. See attached Figure 3.



The IDEIA SPP/APR targets were also used for comparison purposes with Reading and Math State Assessment Proficiency. Overall, Kansas Females slightly outperformed Males in both Reading and Math.

Quality personnel. The analysis of personnel included both general and special education teachers in recognition of the fact that general and special education teachers educated students with disabilities in multiple settings throughout the school day. Per the KSDE Licensed Personnel Report (LPR) Data, FFY 2013, there were a total of 44,152 licensed educational personnel in the state of Kansas, 89.09% of which were returning employees within their school districts. Of 19,800 licenses issued, included were 9,588 license renewals and 1,717 initial standard licenses for Kansas graduates.

For general education teachers, the group with the highest membership was the 30-34 age brackets at 14.05%. However, for special education, the 50-54 age brackets had the highest membership at 14.95%. These figures were representative of the larger trend of special educators being generally closer to retirement than general educators; while 33.25% of general educators were age 50 or over, 42.94% of special educators were at least 50 years old.

Teacher retention statistics were analyzed for teachers that began teaching in the FFY 2009 school year; this initial cohort had a 90.47% three-year retention rate in FFY 2012 and had a 79.93% five-year retention rate in FFY 2013. Teachers entering the profession in FFY 2010 had a 93.53% three-year retention rate, as measured during the FFY 2012 school year. Similarly, teachers entering the profession in FFY 2011 had a 93.15% three-year retention rate, as measured during the FFY 2013 school year.

Across all subject areas, 89.80% of the 59,639 assignments in the state were filled primarily by fully licensed teachers. Fully licensed teachers in Kansas were considered “fully licensed” under the area of assignment. Elementary assignments had the highest percentage of fully licensed instructors at 96.47%. Provisionally licensed teachers in Kansas were licensed teachers but held a “provisional endorsement” in the area of assignment. Districts were granted annual waivers which allowed licensed teachers enrolled in a program of study, to teach a subject or grade level not authorized by the teacher’s Kansas license.

During FFY 2013, Kansas issued 561 licensure waivers to districts. For High-Incidence Special Education there were 413 (73.6%) licensure waivers, Early Childhood Unified 41 (7.3%), Low-Incidence Special Education assignments 37 (6.6%), and Gifted 30 (5.3%). Overall, 89.80% of Kansas’ teaching assignments were filled by fully licensed teachers.

Teachers in elementary classes overwhelmingly qualified as “highly qualified” according to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) standards. In the elementary category, 97.94% of classes were taught by highly qualified teachers, with 99.08% of classes in high poverty buildings and 97.38% of classes in low poverty buildings qualified. This pattern was similar for English Language Arts (96.34%), Mathematics (96.03%), and Science (97.92%) classes at the elementary level.

The trend of high poverty buildings having a larger percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers was also replicated at the secondary level. For English Language Arts, 88.32% of all classes were taught by highly qualified teachers, including 91.86% of the classes in high poverty buildings and 82.24% of classes in low poverty buildings. The percent of special education courses taught by highly qualified teachers was lower, with an overall rate of 53.08%. The percentages of special education classes in core content areas taught by highly qualified teachers were 47.85% for English Language Arts, 49.36% for Mathematics, and 47.70% for Science.

IDEIA SPP/APR indicators. An analysis of Kansas SPP/APR indicators from FFY 2007 to FFY 2012 revealed that the majority met the state targets. All Compliance Indicators either met the state target or were substantially compliant from FFY 2007 to FFY 2012. Targets which were not met or maintained on a consistent long-term basis in the Kansas SPP/APR from FFY 2007 to FFY 2012 were Indicator 3: Performance on Assessments, Indicator 4: Suspension Expulsion, Indicator 5: LRE 6-21 year olds, Indicator 6: Preschool LRE, Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Services, and Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes. KSDE analyzed data annually from these indicators to inform monitoring priorities and to determine statewide technical assistance.

Broad Level Data Analysis Summary

The broad level data analysis with specific references to disaggregated student performance categories (i.e. race and ethnicity, graduation rate state assessments, quality personnel, and SPP/APR indicators, as well as the data sources listed previously in the data analysis section of this plan led to the following conclusions:

1. Even though the percentage of Developmental Delay in Kansas was greater than the percentage of Developmental delay in

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

US, not every state used the Developmental Delay category and Kansas had a definition that was different than other states for Developmental Delay. Therefore, a valid comparison could not be made.

2. Small differences were found in race and ethnic category within disability categories, educational environments and total disciplinary removals.
3. Historically Kansas had a high rate of students with disabilities participating in Kansas state assessments. Overall statewide proficiency/performance rates on assessments showed students with disabilities as well as other subgroups were consistently underperforming across grade levels in reading and math.
4. A larger percentage of classes in low performing schools were taught by "highly qualified" teachers in both elementary and secondary settings. A lower percentage of core content special education classes in reading and math were taught by highly qualified teachers.
5. Over the course of the previous SPP/APR cycle (FFY 2005-2012) Kansas targets were not met or maintained on a consistent long-term basis for the following indicators: Indicator 3: Performance on Assessments, Indicator 4: Suspension Expulsion, Indicator 5: LRE 6-21 year olds, Indicator 6: Preschool LRE, Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Services, and Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes.
6. Multiple year trend data indicating students with disabilities perform below proficient in English Language Arts/Reading converges with data indicating a low percentage of English language Art/Reading classes are taught by highly qualified educators.

Conclusion

Internal and external stakeholders focused on identifying the root causes contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities after reviewing the broad level data results. The group determined that analyzing additional data from the lowest performing schools would provide the most relevant data to identify root causes and lead to an identification of the SIMR.

Focused Data Analysis

The internal and external stakeholders conducted a focused data analysis that covered student data from the 19 districts in Kansas with 66 Focus and 33 Priority schools. The focused data analysis was conducted to identify root causes contributing to low performance of students with disabilities on an existing statewide group of districts with high need schools, specifically Title I schools identified as Focus or Priority schools through ESEA Flexibility Waiver and districts that did not meet clusters of SPP indicators targets. A building-level analysis was conducted across the datasets to determine underperformance correlations between the Kansas ESEA Flexibility Waiver School Performance Data, and IDEIA SPP/APR Compliance and Results Indicator Data.

The classifications of schools contained in the Kansas ESEA Flexibility Waiver are Title I Priority and Focus Schools. Priority schools are those schools identified as five percent of the lowest performing Title I buildings. Low performance is defined as persistently low academic performance across four years of reading and mathematics assessments. An Assessment Performance Index (API) is used to summarize schools' academic performance. Focus schools are schools with the greatest achievement gaps including students with disabilities. As a result of the focused data analysis there is a high correlation between schools with underperformance on SPP indicators and Title I school performance data. Further analysis of performance in all buildings within these districts on reading and math assessments across grade level categories and subgroups, including students with disabilities, revealed underperformance across all buildings regardless of Title I status.

Focused Data Analysis Summary

The results of the focused data analysis revealed:

1. A number of the lowest performing Focus and Priority schools not only underperformed as a building but also across multiple disaggregated populations including, all students, students with disabilities, and English language learners.
2. Underperformance of students with disabilities was prevalent across all buildings in districts with focus and priority schools.
3. There were not significant statewide correlations between student achievement on state assessments in reading or math with other SPP/APR indicators. However, there was a correlation in schools that were identified as focused or priority.
4. Districts with the lowest performance data typically did not request significant technical assistance, unless it was tied to compliance.

Conclusion

The above focused data analysis of Kansas ESEA and IDEIA trend data led to the conclusion that access to the general curriculum, access to quality instruction, and appropriate positive behavior intervention strategies were the root causes contributing to underperformance and lack of measurable improvement of students with disabilities.

Data Quality Assurance

Data used in this analyses are considered to be high quality due to KSDE Data Quality Assurance policies which include training and data certification of district staff and oversight provided by the KSDE TASN evaluation team. Management Information System (MIS) desk audits are conducted annually as part of the ongoing data verification of IDEIA 618 data. Districts are selected for review based on several factors including, but not limited to, inaccurate or untimely data concerns; questionable data policies, practices and procedures employed by the agency; high or low populations in IDEIA 618 data categories; and requests from local directors. During desk audits, district data are collected by reviewing local MIS procedures and individual student information. At this time there is no anticipated need for additional data collection for the purposes of the SSIP.

The SPP/APR Indicators are based on collections from IDEIA 618 data, the general supervision system including formal monitoring and file reviews, fiscal file reviews, the Dispute Resolution Database, parent surveys, student surveys, and data collected from individual districts. Effective processes and procedures are in place to ensure data are valid and reliable. Written specifications and procedures

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

were developed for each indicator. All source data is entered at the district level and imported into the KSDE master database. The Kansas State Department of Education verifies the reliability and accuracy of the data through automated verification checks. In addition, ongoing training and technical assistance provides districts with the information necessary to accurately enter data. Additionally, KSDE contracts for assistance with data management with an Education Service Center and Technical Assistance For Excellence in Special Education.

Compliance Data Consideration

Through the data analysis process used to develop the SSIP, no Kansas district had data to demonstrate a systemic or pervasive IDEA compliance issue and isolated instances of noncompliance were corrected immediately through the Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS). KIAS is an ongoing process of collecting, reviewing and verifying compliance data at the local level. At the state level, Kansas has maintained an OSEP Level of Determination of "Meets Requirements" for seven consecutive years.

Stakeholder Engagement in the Data Analysis

KSDE has a long history of engaging stakeholders through both ongoing and formal partnerships. This is especially true of SEAC and the family centers such as the State PTI and Parent Information Resource Center across the state. Representatives from both family centers were involved in the optional OSEP SSIP technical assistance visit to Kansas, as well as, being actively involved in technical assistance provision, multiple workgroups, and various SEA initiatives.

A comprehensive process was used to identify, select and analyze key existing data, including data from the SPP/APR, IDEA 618 data collections in addition to numerous other data sources. The data analysis process was led by a KSDE SSIP workgroup formed to guide the development of the SSIP. This internal leadership team was comprised of stakeholders internal and external to the SEA, including the KSDE School Improvement Coordinator, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver Coordinator/Assistant Director, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services (ECSETS) Team Director and Assistant Director, KSDE Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) staff and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Project Director. This team continually engaged additional external stakeholders including the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the regional resource center state liaison for Kansas throughout the process to validate interpretations and to provide input for focused data analysis. This broad set of external stakeholders included technical assistance providers, SPDG Evaluators, state parent training information center (Families Together, Inc.) staff, Kansas Parent Information Center (KPIRC) staff, KSDE Board of Education (KSBE), Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members, local special education administrators, the Kansas Learning Network (KLN), General Supervision Timely and Accurate Data (GSTAD) and the Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) project staff.

The broad and focused data analysis process occurred over an extended period of time with multiple opportunities for stakeholder input ensuring accurate and representative data analysis. The entire data analysis process was conducted within an established "plan-do-study-act" cycle of continuous improvement. The discussions occurred across time, settings and participants with SSIP Leadership Team members who brought the data forth and using convergence of data to inform decision-making, as well as, to guide additional data analysis.


Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

KSDE has a long history of engaging stakeholders through both ongoing and formal partnerships. This is especially true of SEAC and the family centers such as the State PTI and Parent Information Resource Center across the state. Representatives from both family centers were involved in the optional OSEP SSIP technical assistance visit to Kansas, as well as, being actively involved in technical assistance provision, multiple workgroups, and various SEA initiatives.

A comprehensive process was used to identify, select and analyze key infrastructure data. The data analysis process was led by a KSDE SSIP workgroup formed to guide the development of the SSIP. This internal leadership team was comprised of stakeholders internal and external to the SEA, including the KSDE School Improvement Coordinator, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver Coordinator/Assistant Director, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services (ECSETS) Team Director and Assistant Director, KSDE Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) staff and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Project Director. This team continually engaged additional external stakeholders including the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the regional resource center state liaison for Kansas throughout the process to validate interpretations and to provide input for focused data analysis. This broad set of external stakeholders included technical assistance providers, SPDG Evaluators, state parent training information center (Families Together, Inc.) staff, Kansas Parent Information Center (KPIRC) staff, KSDE Board of Education (KSBE), Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members, local special education administrators, the Kansas Learning Network (KLN), General Supervision Timely and Accurate Data (GSTAD) and the Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) project staff. (See



The infrastructure analysis process provided multiple opportunities for stakeholder input ensuring accurate and representative analysis. The entire process was conducted within an established “plan-do-study-act” cycle of continuous improvement. The discussions occurred across time and settings. SSIP workgroup members and stakeholders used convergence of data to inform decision-making as well as to guide additional data analysis. Data were considered to be high quality due to KSDE Data Quality Assurance policies which include training and data certification of district staff and oversight provided by the KSDE TASN evaluation team.

Infrastructure Overview

The Kansas State Department of Education, ECSETS Team, in alignment with the goals of the KSBE, supports three strong and aligned statewide initiatives that provide the core of the state infrastructure to support improvement and capacity building of all districts and schools in the state. The current Kansas TASN, Kansas MTSS and KLN systems consist of 14 grant funded projects with over 60 Full Time Employment (FTE) dedicated to providing technical assistance to districts and families to improve the results of students with disabilities. During the 2013-2014 school year, these providers responded to an average of 50+ technical assistance requests on a monthly basis, conducted an estimated 650 classroom walkthroughs within the focus and priority schools in collaboration with district level administration, provided over 549 workshops and trainings in addition to many ongoing technical assistance activities within districts. The analysis of the state infrastructure is based upon data from evaluations of multiple systems, the experience of learning from each of the initiatives, feedback from SEA staff, technical assistance providers and consumers of the services provided.

Governance

The Kansas State Department of Education operates at the discretion of the elected KSBE which, by constitution and state statute, is responsible for the general supervision of public schools, educational institutions, and all of the educational interests of the state, except educational functions delegated by law to the state board of regents. Some of the responsibilities of the KSBE include: determining statewide curricular standards, establishing high school graduation requirements, licensing K-12 educators, accrediting schools and distributing state and federal aid, and such duties as provided by state law. The Kansas State Department of Education is not a cabinet agency under the Governor.

The Commissioner of Education is appointed by the Kansas State Board of Education. The KSDE is comprised of 12 teams organized into three divisions. The Commissioner of Education has ultimate responsibility for the agency. KSDE has two Deputy Commissioners, one that oversees the Division of Fiscal and Administrative Services and one that oversees the Division of Learning Services (DLS). The total number of full-time employees is 250. The DLS houses the ECSETS Team responsible for the administration and monitoring of Title programs including IDEIA 2004. The ECSETS team has one Director, four assistant directors and 32 full time positions who share responsibility for federal program administration, monitoring, professional development, and technical assistance.

Fiscal

The KSDE ensures fiscal accountability in the local education agency (LEA) management of Title program funds including IDEIA. Fiscal Management is included as part of the IDEIA Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS) fiscal onsite and file review. Data are collected and analyzed throughout the year from various sources, such as the annual Local Education Agency Application, KSDE Form 240 federal fund requests, annual local Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and A-133 audit reports, fiscal file review, and other school finance data.

Quality Standards

Kansas has established Quality Standards at both the child/learner level and program level which support implementation of high quality practices on a statewide basis. The standards are as follows:

Kansas Early Learning Standards. The Kansas Early Learning Standards are aligned with the Kansas K-12 College and Career Ready Standards. The Kansas Early Learning Standards are to be used to support the learning and development of young children

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

ages birth to Kindergarten and will also support the work of teachers in Kindergarten through 3rd grade, clearly showing the continuum of learning from birth through grade three. The Kansas Early Learning Standards are not mandatory, are neither an assessment, nor a curriculum, and are not used as entry criteria.

Kansas K-12 College and Career Ready Standards. Standards in Kansas are developed by external stakeholder committees of Kansas educators and are used to help schools to prepare students with the most important knowledge and skills to attain higher education or careers and compete in an increasingly competitive work environment. The Standards are designed for all students, including those with disabilities.

Professional Development

Kansas Technical Assistance System Network. The Kansas TASN (see attached Figure 4) is the system through which KSDE works to build capacity of all districts to improve outcomes for students and families, implementing Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and IDEIA. The Kansas TASN serves as the hub of technical assistance and is designed to be the point of entry for schools and families to access resources and supports. The TASN is administered by KSDE from the ECSETS and is currently comprised of five grant agreements; the SPDG, four contractors, the IDEIA Parent Training Information Center (PTI) and the Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC). The TASN assists KSDE by delivering border-to-border high quality professional learning, consultation and technical assistance which ensures consistency of message, maintains and measures fidelity, builds capacity, and sustains implementation of evidence-based practices. TASN operates within a flexible structure designed to meet changing demands and needs of the state, schools and families in a sustainable and ongoing manner. The TASN Coordination staff members monitor the types of requests that come from families, staff and schools in addition to the responses delivered by providers. These requests and responses are analyzed and presented to the KSDE ECSETS administrative team monthly which allows for resources to be allocated to meet ever-changing needs.

Kansas Multi-tier System of Supports. The Kansas MTSS initiative (see attached Figure 5) is available to all schools and districts across the state. The Kansas MTSS project is a member of the TASN network. The focus of Kansas MTSS is system change across classroom, school, district and state. The framework provides for a continuum of evidence-based practices system wide to support math, reading and behavior. This is not an RtI framework focused solely on special education, but is a system change effort to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of all supports available for ALL students. Since students with disabilities spend the majority of instructional time in the general education setting this initiative impacts all of the instruction students with disabilities receive throughout the school day. The framework addresses Leadership, Professional Learning, and Empowering Culture which includes family engagement, Curriculum and Assessment to support tiered instruction at the early childhood through secondary levels. The Kansas MTSS provides the framework from which all of KSDE's improvement work is approached. The work of Kansas MTSS, includes training and coaching to support schools in the implementation and ongoing refinement of Kansas MTSS. Within Kansas MTSS the self-correcting feedback loop is the data analysis loop that schools use to identify needs, design respond and to evaluation effectiveness.

In FFY 2014 a four year external evaluation of Kansas MTSS was completed by WestEd which provided information for the refinement of the framework to better meet the needs of Kansas schools in a systemic manner. The current status of statewide implementation was assessed and insights were provided as to what it takes to implement Kansas MTSS with fidelity. The evaluations six main findings and recommendations for scaling-up Kansas MTSS are key to the SSIP analysis and are summarized below:

1. The scope and reach of Kansas MTSS as a statewide initiative is well-established in Kansas. The statewide MTSS "presence" is pervasive. The state may be at a tipping point" in terms of statewide scale-up and installation of Kansas MTSS across the state.
2. Schools are demonstrating hallmarks of strong implementation of the Kansas MTSS Framework; specifically, strong leadership at the school and district level, high quality core curriculum, instruction and assessment practices, an empowering culture with increased teacher collaboration, data use, ongoing professional development, and the alignment and integration of school improvement initiatives,
3. Implementation of Kansas MTSS at the school level is increasingly consistent with the Kansas MTSS framework. Schools are moving from exploration/learning about Kansas MTSS to more advanced implementation stages over time.
4. At the local level, Kansas MTSS is substantially contributing to improved student outcomes as well as benefits to teachers, improved instruction and school functioning. Currently the state lacks the authority to require districts to report progress monitoring data.
5. KSDE has established an effective statewide infrastructure to support and sustain Kansas MTSS implementation.
6. Kansas MTSS implementation is being refined in Kansas to focus on the district, rather than the individual school level, and to the use of an "integrated model" where the areas of reading, math and behavior are approached simultaneously.

The external evaluation concluded with the recommendation that KSDE "Stay the course". Evaluators recommend and recognize that KSDE's continued investment in district-level capacity building, the strengthening of Kansas MTSS, and continual adherence to the Kansas MTSS Framework, as more districts and schools join the ranks, will sustain and expand Kansas MTSS over time. Investment in a statewide student progress data system would enable KSDE to document the impact Kansas MTSS is having on student outcomes.

Technical Assistance and Training Formats

KSDE utilizes multiple methods for providing technical assistance to districts that ultimately lead to systemic improvements and enhanced student outcomes including; (a) guidance documents, (b) technical assistance and professional learning, (c) enforcement and sanctions, (d) data reporting, (e) State Education Agency (SEA) resources, and (f) incorporation of SPP/APR indicators into overall school improvement initiatives. The Kansas TASN (www.ksdetasn.org) serves as the hub for local districts or parents to request assistance as well as disseminates common technical assistance materials that include and are not limited to Individual Education Plan (IEP) training, Emergency Safety Intervention (ESI) training, Evaluation and Eligibility, and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM).

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

KSDE supports three sign language interpreter projects across the state. These projects are; (a) TASK 12: An Education Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) Consortium consisting of 14 states; b) support for geographically isolated sign language interpreters in Western Kansas; and (c) sign language interpreter training. KSDE co-funds the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) in cooperation with the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Part C Lead Agency. Every district is eligible for KSDE Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) grant funds that support achievement and improvement of results for students as measured by the SPP Indicators. Annually, KSDE provides multiple funding awards to organizations for work that is aligned with KSDE goals.

Guidance Documents

The KSDE provides guidance documents to assist districts in implementing IDEIA and state special education statutes. The Kansas Special Education Process Handbook and reimbursement guide documents are developed, field tested by stakeholders, and published based on needs or changes in OSEP or KSDE's requirements. In addition to the Kansas College and Career Ready Standards documents, KSDE has guidance documents on Eligibility Determination, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Autism.

The KSDE guidance documents are available in hard copy or on the website www.ksde.org. Additionally, the ECSETS team webpage on www.ksde.org was reorganized so the above documents can be easily located by parents, teachers, and administrators.

IDEIA State Performance Plan and ESEA School Improvement

From FFY 2007 to FFY 2012 KSDE operationally organized the SPP Indicators into strategic clusters of improvement activities. As a result, improvement activities were integrated into the components of the SPP/APR school improvement practices. Most notable were the subsequent school improvement practices included in the Kansas ESEA Flexibility Waiver to support Focus and Priority Schools. In FFY 2012, after receiving approval for a waiver of AYP under ESEA Flexibility, the KSDE reorganized. Three separate teams combined into one collaborative team now known as Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services (ECSETS). As one team within the KSDE Division of Learning Services (DLS), one State Director and four Assistant Directors now oversee all IDEIA and ESEA Title program activities related to general supervision, monitoring, technical assistance, funding, and professional learning. This includes ESEA Flexibility Waiver school improvement supports to Focus and Priority School delivered through the Kansas Learning Network (KLN).

Kansas Learning Network. The Kansas Learning Network (KLN) is the mechanism through which KSDE supports 19 districts with 33 Title I Priority and 66 Focus Schools. The KLN process begins with a comprehensive District Needs Assessment and School Needs Assessments conducted with each district and each Priority and Focus School. These needs assessments consist of surveys of staff, students and parents; focus group interviews with parents, community members and stakeholders; and classroom walkthrough observations in each school to assess the use of evidence-based practices within individual classrooms. The results of the needs assessments are used to develop District and School Action Plans through a collaborative process that includes the district, schools, KSDE staff, KSDE TASN providers and the KPIRC staff. Priority schools receive eight days of support from an implementation coach and two onsite visits annually. Focus schools receive six days of support from an implementation coach and one onsite visit annually. Within the KLN a continuous improvement feedback loop is used as the school improvement process is implemented. The entire process is comprised of support provided by implementation coaches, building needs assessments, focus groups, building visits, surveys, and documentation of individual building progress entered in KansaStar, which is an ongoing evaluation and communication tool customized to align with KSBE initiatives. The needs of struggling learners, including students with disabilities, are integral to the design of the support provided.

Accountability/Monitoring

The general supervision system in Kansas is the Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS). All districts are monitored annually to ensure improved academic results for students with disabilities. Kansas uses the KIAS to collect reliable and valid data. KIAS aligns with IDEIA 2004 and general supervision requirements as outlined by federal and state statutes. Monitoring includes self-assessments, desk audits, onsite visits, fiscal reviews, annual performance reports, formal complaints, and due process hearings. The KIAS creates an integrated, continuous process involving data collection and verification, identification of compliance status and 100% correction of noncompliance within one year consistent with Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memo 09-02. Each district receives appropriate rewards, enforcements and technical assistance based on results.

KSDE utilizes a practice to policy feedback loop to refine the Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS), including a KIAS stakeholder group comprised of district special education director representatives from each region of the Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators (KASEA). Further, ongoing communication and feedback on KIAS is gathered through meetings with all Kansas Technical Assistance Network (TASN) providers, which includes PTI, agency staff, and other technical assistance providers. These TASN provider meetings also provide opportunities for agency staff to train and communicate updates on KIAS with these partners. Additionally, KSDE provided training on KIAS, including timely information on any refinements to the system, to district staff on an ongoing basis through conference calls, written memoranda, and direct technical assistance with individual districts.

System Strengths, Coordination and Improvement

The current strengths and coordination across these systems that address the SIMR include:

- Technical assistance and professional learning provided are timely, relevant, build capacity and lead to the sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices shown to improve student outcomes.
- Statewide initiatives in Kansas to improve outcomes for students can be implemented without mandates.
- Implementation science is used in the development and provision of technical assistance and professional learning within the state system.
- KSDE operates an effective statewide infrastructure to support and sustain Kansas MTSS implementation.
- At the local level, Kansas MTSS is substantially contributing to improved student outcomes as well as benefits to teachers, improved instruction and school functioning.
- KLN is an effective framework that includes a planning process and implementation tools to support underperforming Title schools.

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

- Meaningful and effective family engagement plans are implemented in schools of all sizes.

The identified relevant areas for improvement within and across the system that relate to the SIMR include:

- Alignment of guidance and priorities, within the SEA to the district is imperative for integrated program delivery to occur.
- Data used to determine district assistance needs to be intentionally aligned and systemic, rather than based on discrete data sets and independent decisions.
- District adoption of a tiered system of instructional supports is more effective when district interventions and approaches to both behavior and academic are addressed simultaneously.
- The capacity of districts to monitor ongoing student progress within and across student subgroups needs to be strengthened.
- The limited access to student progress data makes evaluation of student level data challenging.

Description of State Level Initiatives

Three state level general and special education initiatives, each of which include improvement plans, have been identified, analyzed and discussed in detail. The following three initiatives will impact the capacity of local districts and schools to implement strategies that lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR.

1) The Kansas TASN is the system through which KSDE works to build capacity of all districts to improve outcomes for all students and families. The Kansas TASN serves as the hub of technical assistance, assists in carrying out IDEIA monitoring through KIAS, and is designed to be the point of entry for schools and families to access resources and supports.

2) The Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) is the Kansas tiered instruction and systemic change initiative available to all districts and schools. The focus of Kansas MTSS is system change across the classroom, school, district and state. The framework provides for a continuum of evidence-based practices system wide to support the academic, social/behavioral needs of all students.

3) The Kansas Learning Network (KLN) is the general education mechanism through which KSDE supports districts with Title I Priority and Focus Schools. The KLN process includes a comprehensive District Needs Assessment and School Needs Assessments, focus groups, building visits, surveys, and documentation of individual building progress entered in KansaStar, an Indistar product and ongoing support provided by implementation coaches.

Alignment of State Level Plans and Initiatives

From these three major initiatives, district and schools may have three plans that could influence improvement of the SIMR. Through KIAS a corrective action plan is required as part of Kansas' KIAS IDEIA monitoring. When a district engages in Kansas MTSS a comprehensive instructional implementation plan for academics and behavior is written. The third plan is the Kansas ESEA Flexibility Waiver and implemented within KLN. This plan is documented and monitored through the KansaStar.

These are aligned to the extent that:

- Oversight of all three initiatives is provided by the KSDE Division of Learning Services.
- Staff from KSDE, TASN and Kansas MTSS are involved in current KLN activities.
- Additional indicators specific to tiered instruction have been included in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver plan requirements.
- All efforts focus on improving reading outcomes as well as other academic and behavior outcomes of students.

These will be coordinated and leveraged by:

- Providing a consistent approach to high quality reading instruction for all students especially students with disabilities
- Aligning SEA policy to integrate program service delivery
- Providing targeted technical assistance and professional learning across plans and initiatives
- Ensuring quality implementation of evidence-based practices in a manner that integrates academics and behavior

The alignment and coordination across these three initiatives will result in the achievement of the SIMR. This is possible due to the strong collaboration across the KSDE Division of Learning Services and the ECSETS Leadership Team which oversees all of these efforts. In addition, KSDE, TASN and the state family centers have an authentic meaningful working relationship and a pervasive culture of data-based decision making. All of these initiatives address reading achievement and include technical assistance and professional learning to increase the capacity of districts to implement evidence-based practices. The Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies focus on increased alignment to support capacity building within the SEA and across Kansas districts to improve reading achievement for students with disabilities.

Phase I and II Stakeholder Representation

Using the internal and external stakeholders, the SEA used a comprehensive process to analyze the State's infrastructure to develop the SSIP. Led by the KSDE SSIP workgroup, the analysis process leveraged the existing infrastructure to maximize current efforts. This team continually engaged stakeholders throughout the process to solicit ideas, validate interpretations, suggest language and provide input for deeper analysis. The entire process was conducted within an established "plan-do-study-act" cycle of continuous improvement. The discussions occurred over time, settings and participants with KSDE SSIP workgroup members who used convergence of data to inform decision-making as well as to guide additional data analysis. The list of partners represented in the development of Phase I include:

- Kansas State Board of Education - KSBE
- Office of Deputy Commissioner Learning Services – KSDE

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

- Kansas Special Education Advisory Council - SEAC
- Director of Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services – KSDE
- Assistant Directors, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services – KSDE
- KSDE School Improvement Coordinator – KSDE
- Kansas ESEA Flexibility Waiver Coordinator – KSDE
- Kansas ESEA Advisory Council - KSDE
- Regional Resource Center State Liaison - Utah State University
- State Personnel Development Grant Project Director – KSDE
- TASN Coordination and Evaluation – Utah State University, Pittsburg State University
- State Personnel Development Grant Evaluation – University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning
- State Personnel Development Grant Tertiary Behavior Supports – Keystone Learning Services
- Technical Assistance Providers – Utah State University TAESE
- Kansas Parent Information Resource Center - KPIRC
- Kansas IDEIA Parent Training and Information Center – Families Together, Inc.
- Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators - KASEA
- Kansas Learning Network - KLN
- TASN Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) – Keystone Learning Services
- TASN General Supervision Timely and Accurate Data (GSTAD) - Keystone Learning Services

All of the Phase I partners are committed to continued support of the implementation during Phase II of the Kansas SSIP. In addition, the following partners will become involved in Phase II:

- TASN Kansas Learning Network (KLN) – Southwest Plains Regional Education Service Center
- State Personnel Development Grant Co-Teaching – UPC Seguin of Greater Chicago
- TASN Evaluation – University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning
- TASN Coordination – Utah State University, Pittsburg State University and Keystone Learning Services
- TASN MTSS: CI3T – Keystone Learning Services
- TASN Infinetec – UCP Seguin of Greater Chicago

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

The percentage of students with disabilities who score at grade level benchmark on AIMSweb reading assessment for Kindergarten through 5th grades in the targeted buildings will increase to 37.50% by 2018.

Description

STATE IDENTIFIED MEASURABLE RESULTS (SIMR) FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Basis of SIMR

A comprehensive data and infrastructure analysis was used to develop the SIMR and to inform the Kansas' State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) within the Kansas SPP. The data analysis process led to the identification of improvement of reading instruction, aligned with current agency initiatives and priorities. The SIMR is based upon the extensive review of performance and compliance trend data from districts and schools, and analysis of the state infrastructure and capacity. Through lessons learned from the development and implementation of the Kansas MTSS, KLN, and the TASN, including feedback from external and internal stakeholders a SIMR was identified.

SIMR selection process. The systemic process used to select the SIMR actively engaged internal and external stakeholders. The process leading to the selection of the SIMR occurred over an extended period of time and multiple opportunities for stakeholder input to ensure valid and reliable data driven decisions. OSEP staff helped guide the development of the SIMR scope and measurement during a June 2014 onsite and follow-up email communications. The first version of the Kansas SIMR was drafted by the SSIP workgroup using SPP/APR trend data from FFY 2005-2012 and reviewed by the KSDE leadership team. A second refinement occurred after input and feedback was received from the Kansas SEAC, Kansas MTSS Project, and the SPP/APR Workgroup members. The Kansas stakeholders reviewed the SSIP and SIMR a total of four times prior to submission. The entire process was conducted within an established "plan-do-study-act" cycle of continuous improvement.

Impact on Child-Level Outcomes

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

After multiple discussions, stakeholders recommended the following State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR), "The percentage of students with disabilities who score at grade level benchmark on the AIMSweb reading assessment for Kindergarten through 5th grades in the targeted buildings will increase to 37.50% by 2018."

The need for increased effectiveness of evidence-based instructional reading practices is demonstrated by the gap between students with disabilities performing at grade level and those students who perform below grade level as described in the data analysis and infrastructure sections of this SSIP.

In order for students with disabilities to benefit from evidence-based instructional reading practices, students must have access to quality reading instruction provided by highly qualified teachers. As a result TASN, the KSDE state system of professional development and technical assistance will be leveraged to coordinate, and build capacity of districts to deliver and monitor student-level interventions. TASN and MTSS have been designed and are implemented within a systemic approach which include the principles of implementation science research.

AIMSweb. The appropriate child level outcome measure for the SIMR is AIMSweb. AIMSweb is a General Outcome Measure that is aligned, complementary, and predictive of achievement on large scale outcome assessments such as the Kansas State Assessment. AIMSweb assessment provides instructionally derived child level outcome data at all grade levels of the target group for the Kansas SIMR. Permission to use AIMSweb was sought and received from OSEP in the Fall of 2014. The Kansas State Assessments are derived from the Kansas College and Career Ready Standards (KCCRS) and used for reporting data on IDEIA State Performance Plan Indicator 3: Assessment Participation and Performance.

Reading Achievement. Reading achievement is central to the foundations of early learning. Students with disabilities in Kansas underperform in reading as identified in the data analysis of the SPP/APR trend data. The focus of the Kansas SIMR on Kindergarten through 5th grade reading is based on the early literacy research that demonstrates reading as the skill of entry to successfully be involved in core instruction across all content areas. Grades Kindergarten through 3rd are the years when students are primarily focused on learning to read prior to the focus shifting to reading to learn in later grades. By extending the measurement of the Kansas SIMR through 5th grade allows additional instructional time to demonstrate results.

Statewide results. While the Kansas SIMR targets a subset of districts within Kansas, all districts will have increased capacity to improve results for students with disabilities in reading through access to refined knowledge, sustained professional learning, and specialized technical assistance as part of the Kansas TASN dissemination activities and SSIP implementation.

According to the implementation science research, specifically the implementation drivers, statewide implementation in every school building simultaneously would be extremely difficult. When addressing the competency drivers of selection, training and coaching, a minimum three year implementation commitment is needed to achieve sustainability. For this reason, Kansas will focus on a subset of districts and will scale-up over the five years of this SSIP. This approach is in recognition of the implementation science and existing state resources available to support sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices to achieve the Kansas SIMR.

The systematic approach to scaling-up state capacity to support districts through infrastructure and tool development will also result in sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices. Kansas' SSIP addresses this through the use of the cascading model of implementation as described by National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). In this model, Dr. Rob Horner describes, "...the State as the unit of coordination, the District as the unit of implementation, the School as the unit of intervention and the Student as the unit of impact."

As described in the Theory of Action, statewide sustainability begins at the state level through intentional coordination across leadership, accountability and technical assistance systems. When these systems are aligned and consistent, district capacity for the implementation of evidence-based practices can be realized and coached in a sustainable manner resulting in improved child level outcomes for all schools.

Stakeholder Involvement

Multiple external stakeholders from the Kansas SEAC, Families Together, Inc. which is the Kansas PTI, KPIRC, Kansas MTSS, KLN, the Regional Resource Center state liaison for Kansas and multiple internal stakeholders from the KSDE Office of the Commissioner, DLS, Early Childhood Unit, State Title I, III, IDEIA Part B Special Education and the 619 Coordinator were engaged in the process of establishing the proposed SIMR, baseline and yearly targets. These internal and external stakeholders represented persons with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, teachers, principals, superintendents, higher education faculty, state school staff, correctional facilities, vocational rehabilitation representative, and other state agency representatives.

Measurable and Rigorous Baseline Data and Targets


The baseline data from FFY 2013 for the selected SIMR and measurement tool is included in the Grads360 Table at the beginning of this indicator. This baseline reflects a percentage of students with disabilities scoring at grade level benchmark on a general outcome measure for reading within targeted grade levels. Baseline data for FFY 2013 were established using the cohort that started Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework intervention in FFY 2014. Measurable and rigorous targets expressed as percentages for each of the five years from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018 are included in the table at the beginning of this indicator. The FFY 2018 target reflects measurable improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

The Kansas State Department of Education encourages classroom through district level system-wide improvement for the purpose of achieving measurable improvement for all students, including students with disabilities. This philosophy is reflected in Kansas' ESEA Flexibility Waiver, the design and delivery of the Kansas MTSS, as well as, the implementation science reflected in the design of the TASN.

Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0: The current state level policies, organization and infrastructure will be strategically realigned to allocate and leverage SEA supports for increasing district capacity. The first Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy addresses the following root causes: a) the lack of alignment and priorities from the SEA to the district; and b) district assistance being determined on discrete data sets and independent decisions. Implementation of strategic realignment at this level will increase the efficiency of providing state level technical assistance, as well as, alignment across IDEA, Title and School Improvement programs. Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 is designed to address the Organizational Drivers of System Intervention, Facilitative Administration and Decision Support Data Systems. (See attached Figure 6.)



Outcome 1.1. Realign priorities, operating principles, scopes of work and allocate resources to meet changing needs. This will involve establishment of common definitions and expectations for professional development and technical assistance. The implementation science describes the need for the infrastructure to have clear expectations and a mechanism to monitor implementation of behaviors consistent with expectations. This includes intentional policy and program alignment, allocation of resources and implementation at the state level to support integrated program delivery within districts.

Outcome 1.2. Facilitate communication, collaboration and resources across KSDE and TASN providers to support dissemination and implementation of evidenced-based instructional practices for educators, related service personnel, administrators, families and community based settings. KSDE, Division of Learning Services, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services and TASN cross-team and cross-initiative policy work related to accountability, improvement, workgroups, conferences and technical assistance will be planned, implemented and evaluated.

Outcome 1.3. Establish a multi-level system accountability plan that will maximize effectiveness and efficiency of KSDE and TASN providers. With leadership from the TASN evaluation team, identify methods to evaluate impact through short term, intermediate and long term results. Establish a multi-level system accountability plan that supports the operation of an ongoing feedback loop, allows for barrier identification, error correction, measures of collaboration effectiveness and responsiveness.

Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0: Design, implement and evaluate a school improvement planning process built upon the Kansas MTSS: CI3T framework to increase the district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities. The second Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy is designed to address the following root causes: a) challenges with sustaining the MTSS framework; and b) lack of state capacity to monitor ongoing student progress in reading within and across student subgroups. Through the activities required to implement Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, the Leadership Drivers will be addressed within each district engaged in the Kansas SSIP process. This coupled with the findings of the data analysis and leveraging of current state plans to integrate school improvement supports provided through ESEA and IDEA, a decision was made to implement

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

the interventions at the district level. Implementing interventions at the district level will sustain practices and achieve systemic improvement while simultaneously increasing the KSDE capacity to lead meaningful change in Kansas districts.

Outcome 2.1. Scale-up and increase the capacity of the SEA to provide district level MTSS:CI3T training and coaching. Assess and refine materials to ensure effective and efficient training of districts. In addition, select, train, and coach MTSS trainers to increase the capacity of districts for providing sustainable implementation of MTSS:CI3T across buildings. This approach not only focuses on maintaining effective evidence-based practices but is reflective of the cascading leadership model described in the materials and work of the State Implementation and Scaling-Up of Evidence Based Practices Program (SISEP) Center.

Outcome 2.2. Implement the MTSS:CI3T training system focusing on districts with demonstrated needs to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities. Identify and train districts to develop, implement and evaluate a comprehensive integrated tiered district plan to implement MTSS:CI3T from Kindergarten through 5th grade. Provide ongoing coaching and monitor fidelity of implementation, including a focus on evidence-based reading practices for students with disabilities.

Outcome 2.3. Evaluate the degree to which the state infrastructure supports LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th grade. Building upon the implementation science, and prior Kansas IDEA State Personnel Development Grant evaluation efforts, design and establish principles for monitoring fidelity and performance. Utilize guided feedback from schools, districts, and the SEA to help establish measures related to the attainment of identified competencies, implementation and sustained use of evidence-based reading practices over time.

Figure 1 Provides a graphic depiction of how Kansas MTSS:CI3T applies to the stages of implementation science and the implementation drivers at the state, district and school levels, and how the SSIP can support establishment of a multi-level systemic infrastructure.

Selection of Improvement Strategies

The Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies selected are based on the extensive review of performance and compliance trend data including data from the Kansas FFY 2005 - 2012 SPP improvement activities, and analysis of the state infrastructure and capacity. Two Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies are built upon the results of the SSIP data and infrastructure analysis and specifically build upon the existing initiatives within Kansas with particular attention to the Implementation Science which is integrated into these initiatives over the past four years.

Sound, Logical and Aligned Improvement Strategies

This approach not only focuses on supporting effective and sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices but is also reflective of the cascading leadership model as described in the materials and work of the State Implementation and Scaling-Up of Evidence Based Practices Program (SISEP) Center. For example, the references to the implementation drivers that support sustainable change within the second Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy demonstrate that the improvement strategies are sound and logical and are aligned with the three identified state initiatives.

The Kansas MTSS framework, in operation since 2007 and focused on adoption of math, reading, or behavior, was assessed by objective external evaluators from WestEd over a four-year period 2010-2014. Kansas MTSS external evaluators report that 48% of Kansas' 1,472 schools, which represent 67% of Kansas' school districts, participated in some level of formal Kansas MTSS training (WestEd, 2015). A random sampling of over 2000 Kindergarten through 6th grade students compiled by Kansas MTSS indicates that 88% of Kindergarten through 6th grade students in Kansas MTSS participating schools demonstrated an increase in reading skills in just one semester of implementation, and 84% of the students identified as needing special education services showed growth in the same time period. Anecdotal success stories abound from schools reporting that the MTSS framework is part of the school routine and responsible for school improvement.

Despite the success Kansas MTSS has experienced, evaluators noted evidence that "pockets of excellence", schools at full implementation are being created in districts across the state and a more focused scaling up effort is warranted. Ninety-six percent of the schools reporting full implementation indicate Kansas MTSS is part of a comprehensive system aligned with other school improvement activities (WestEd, 2014). The Kansas MTSS, using the self-correcting feedback loop to attend to changing needs and make ongoing revisions, analyzed the current MTSS training system for root cause connections to KSDE's ESEA school improvement initiatives. While the current training model for Kansas MTSS has supported schools through implementation stages of MTSS in reading, math or behavior, few have simultaneously developed a comprehensive approach to addressing academics, behavior and social components as an integrated package.

Informed by WestEd external evaluation data and successes from current Kansas MTSS scaling up effort and fueled by the expertise of the Kansas MTSS team and other TASN providers, KSDE intends to move forward by scaling up an even more powerful, sustainable and integrated model to respond to the need for a more coherent approach to school improvement by scaling up a Multi-Tier System of Supports: Integrated Framework model of prevention. The Kansas MTSS Integrated activities will expand to more comprehensively address Kansas State Board of Education's goals and objectives of providing a flexible and efficient delivery system to meet students' varied and changing needs; Encourage the implementation of tiered instruction and learning in all Kansas schools; Promote and encourage best practices for early childhood programs; and Develop active communication and partnerships with families, communities, business stakeholders, constituents, and policy partner (Kansas State Board Goals and Objectives, n.d.)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Strategies to Achieve Measurable Improvement

The Kansas SSIP will be guided by the implementation drivers which are the “processes that can be leveraged to improve competence and to create a more hospitable organizational and systems environment for an evidence-based program or practice” (Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005). The competency driver focuses on selection, training and coaching to ensure the implementer has the skills and resources necessary to put the evidence-based practice in place. The organization driver, sometimes referred to as the capacity driver, includes a decision support data system (to monitor both process and outcomes), facilitative administration (to reduce barriers and engineer host environments), and systems intervention (maintain vision, being aware of external issues, help sustain policy to sustain work), and system performance evaluation (monitor implementation fidelity to create and sustain new practices in host environments) (Fixsen, Blasé, Naoom, & Wallace, 2009). The driver that consists of the “mechanisms that provide direction and vision for the practices and allocations of resources” is referred to as the leadership driver (Fixsen, 2013). Each of these drivers is connected to one another to improve the organization and effectiveness and ability to achieve outcomes.

The Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies align with the priorities of the Kansas Board of Education and the Kansas State Department of Education. These coherent improvement strategies promote the philosophy that quality instructional practices and effective classroom management are interdependent. Behavior and academic outcomes are highly correlated. The KSDE and stakeholders are committed to the creation of a culture of prevention through improved instructional environments that support positive student performance and enhance school connectedness. The vision is to provide a comprehensive, multi-tiered system of supports to meet the academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs of all learners. Achieving this vision will measurably increase the number of students with disabilities in grades Kindergarten through 5th that read at grade level, and become college and career-ready.

Stakeholder Involvement

The Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies were selected with involvement from multiple internal and external stakeholders. The internal stakeholders were comprised of the KSDE School Improvement Coordinator, ESEA Waiver Coordinator/Assistant Director, Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services Team Director and Assistant Director, KSDE TASN Coordination staff and the SPDG Project Director. This team continually engaged external stakeholders throughout the process to validate interpretations and to provide input for Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies. The external stakeholders included technical assistance providers, SPDG Evaluators, State PTI center staff, KPIRC staff, KSDE Board of Education, Kansas SEAC members, local special education administrators, the KLN and members from the Kansas MTSS initiative.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☒ Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

THEORY OF ACTION

Kansas has depicted the Theory of Action as follows: 1) inserted Figure 8: Theory of Action Table illustration, 2) a narrative description of the table illustration, and 3) Figure 7: Kansas SSIP Theory of Action Graphic Overview attachment.

Description of Theory of Action Table. Through the comprehensive data and infrastructure analyses conducted by the SEA with input and involvement of internal and external stakeholders a Theory of Action was developed. The complexity of the political, economic and accountability environment are ever changing at the state level. However, within this context, through the SSIP, the SEA has developed a Theory of Action that simplifies the details that will provide the consistent guide and focus for the work of improving educationally significant outcomes for students with disabilities in Kansas.

In the first column, the key features of the state infrastructure that directly impact the SIMR are identified. In the second column, are the strengths and needs identified during the comprehensive data and infrastructure analysis which must be addressed in order for the Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies to impact the SIMR. These actions must cross governance and quality standards, accountability, monitoring, technical assistance and professional learning for sustainable statewide systemic change to be achieved. A comprehensive description of these actions can be found in the sections specific to Data Analysis and Analysis of State Infrastructure.

Column three, Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0, describes the evidence-based actions to be taken by the SEA which will closely align state level policies, practices and procedures and increase the capacity of statewide systems of professional learning and technical assistance.

Column four, Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, describes the evidence-based actions that will be taken by districts to improve the measurable results for students with disabilities as described in the Kansas SIMR. The evidence-based action taken by districts to

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


achieve the SIMR is the full and sustainable implementation of Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. (formerly referred to as MTSS: CI3T). This implementation will result in significant instructional improvement and improve outcomes for students with disabilities in reading as measured by the SIMR.

Together, columns three and four demonstrate the interdependence of the two Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies and how the strategies bring the system together to achieve a statewide systemic approach for supporting schools and families of students with disabilities across multiple programs and levels. The improved alignment of programs, policies, and practices within KSDE will increase integrated service delivery and statewide implementation of the Kansas Multi- Tier System of Supports: Integrated Framework. These two ambitious and achievable coherent improvement strategies will result in students with disabilities receiving effective evidence-based interventions and achieving the Kansas SIMR.

The fifth column is the SIMR described fully in the State-identified Measurable Results section. This column shows the identified intermediate measures specific to Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report and the identified SIMR. While improving reading performance is a significant and important measure, KSDE also views reading as as one intermediate step and part of more comprehensive plan for overall improvement of student performance that will impact outcomes for districts, schools, students and families, PreK through college and career ready.

The Theory of Action table serves as a summary of the involvement, feedback and input of internal and external stakeholders throughout the entire SSIP analysis and development process. In addition, a broad range of stakeholders, including the Kansas SEAC members and PTI center staff have reviewed and provided feedback.

Summary: Figure 7 Graphic Overview Summarized in the following graphic overview are connections between the State-Identified Measurable results of two Kansas Coherent Improvement Activities which comprise the Kansas State Systemic Improvement Plan. The two Kansas Coherent Improvement activities were derived from stakeholder analysis and identification of new and existing partnerships across multiple systems. As a result, Kansas will have an improved aligned state system with districts capable of increasing the percentage of students with disabilities who read at grade level on a general outcome measure.



Infrastructure Development

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

COMPONENT #1: ELEMENTS OF STATE INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

*Terminology Notes: Due to the alignment and refinement of the infrastructure since Phase I, the following terminology changed in Phase II:

- Kansas MTSS Core Team is now referred to as the Kansas MTSS Project
- Kansas MTSS: CI3T is now referred to as the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework

The Kansas SSIP is composed of three rigorous coherent improvement strategies:

1.0 Strategically realign, reallocate, and leverage current State Education Agency (SEA) policies, organization and infrastructure for increased capacity of district evidence-based practice implementation;

2.0 Design, implement and evaluate an integrated school improvement planning framework, built upon the existing Kansas

3.0 Evaluate the degree to which the state infrastructure supports district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th Grade.

The state will take actions to improve strategic alignment of state level policies, organization, and infrastructure to leverage State Education Agency (SEA) supports for increasing district capacity through Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0. Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 is focused on infrastructure improvement at the SEA level to support and scale up evidence-based practices. This specific improvement strategy is to enhance the intensity of support for local districts, to improve, develop, implement, and support continuous evaluation of evidence-based practices through a comprehensive system of technical assistance delivery referred to as the Kansas Technical Assistance Systems Network (TASFN). These combined efforts will scale-up evidence-based practices that ultimately will improve results for children with disabilities 3-21 years old.

The overall Kansas TASN (Figure 4, Version 2) is organized to meet specific needs identified by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) and guided by the Kansas State Performance Plan (SPP). The KSDE Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services (ECSETS) Leadership Team allocates the funding and oversees the direction, planning, implementation, and evaluation of Kansas TASN.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 is a subset of the Kansas TASN work and targets the statewide delivery system for professional development and technical assistance accessed by districts and buildings that are engaged in full scale adoption of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework (Figure 1, Version 2). The Kansas MTSS Project staff members and state trainers provide the evidence-based professional development and technical assistance to the staff from the districts and buildings that have children with disabilities targeted by the Kansas State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and measured by the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

SEA General and Special Education Initiative Alignment

Implementation of Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 strategically improves alignment and coherency of state level infrastructure policies and leverages State Education Agency (SEA) practices which increase district capacity. Achievement of Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 is accomplished through realigning priorities, establishing operating principles, constructing scopes of work, and allocating resources to meet changing needs. The following activities were designed and are being implemented to align and leverage current improvement plans at the SEA level:

1.1 Redesign of the Kansas TASN includes technical assistance and professional learning scopes of work identified as essential by the KSDE. See Figure 4, Version 2 for the updated TASN Organizational Chart. The KSDE ECSETS Leadership Team provides the funding and oversees the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Kansas TASN.

1.2 Realign the Kansas TASN priorities, standard operating principles, scopes of work, and reallocate resources to address the needs and barriers emerging from the Kansas SSIP Phase I data. Additionally, analyze the infrastructure and utilize stakeholder input when determining the issues relating to the scopes of work and addressing needs and barriers identified in the first component.

1.3 Redesign the Kansas TASN 2016-2020 Request for Applications (RFA) and establish new priorities, common definitions, performance expectations, and new methods to monitor delivery of professional development and technical assistance providers. Review, select, and approve contracts for the provision of professional development and technical assistance based on the requirements for Kansas TASN 2016-2020 RFA.

Activities 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 were accomplished during FFY2014. Two of the eight priorities in the Kansas TASN 2016-2020 RFA include: (1) system of coordination and (2) system of evaluation designed to support alignment and accountability of all support for scaling-up evidence-based technical assistance across the state. (Figure 4, Version 2) Kansas TASN consists of approximately 60 dedicated staff members from 11 projects, including Kansas MTSS, who receive ongoing guidance, coaching, and feedback on the implementation and evaluation of evidence-based practices from staff members of the Coordination and Evaluation Projects. The remaining priorities and areas of professional learning with dedicated staff members in the Kansas TASN include: instructional technology, autism and tertiary behavior supports, co-teaching, teacher recruitment and retention, priority and focus school supports, family engagement, and preparation and resources for teachers of the blind and teachers of the deaf.

Collaborative Implementation of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices

A fourth activity is **1.4 facilitation of communication, collaboration, and resources across KSDE and Kansas TASN providers to support dissemination and implementation of evidence-based instructional practices for educators, related service personnel, administrators, and families, including home and community based settings.** Steps to further align and leverage current improvement plans focus on engaging stakeholders to inform systems of accountability, improvement planning, professional learning, and technical assistance. This effort will be done within the SEA and across Kansas TASN providers. This effort is guided by a common set of definitions and the Kansas TASN Standard Operating Principles (Attachment 1) that all Kansas TASN providers must use to guide the direction of activities, systematize installation, implementation, and evaluation.

Five of the fourteen Kansas TASN Standard Operating Principles are summarized as follows:

1. All providers must actively participate, collaborate, and support KSDE initiatives.

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

2. All proposed objectives and activities will align with and support implementation of the Kansas MTSS that aligns with the SSIP and SIMR.
3. All activities will utilize an implementation science framework.
4. All technical assistance projects, including Kansas MTSS, will demonstrate capacity and commitment through action and evaluation, to provide statewide support in each Kansas State Board of Education region.
5. All technical assistance projects, including the Kansas MTSS, will provide KSDE with data to assist in planning and reporting for the SPP, the APR, and the Kansas SSIP.

Implementation Responsibilities

The infrastructure development specific to the Kansas SSIP will be led and directed by members of the KSDE ECSETS Leadership Team. KSDE ECSETS members are responsible for the oversight of multiple federal and state programs, including IDEA General Supervision, ESEA Title Programs, ESEA Implementation, State Personnel Development Grant and Early Childhood Programs. The necessary resources will originate from the ECSETS team and staff members of the Kansas TASN that support district capacity building.

The initial alignment of priorities and reallocation of resources occurred during the 2014-2015 school year. Through ongoing monitoring of the system and collaboration with partners, Kansas' infrastructure will continue to be refined based upon state needs and resources.

The KSDE ECSETS Leadership Team members share responsibility for implementing Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 addressing the infrastructure. The ongoing implementation involves collaborative discussions across multiple offices within the KSDE and is supported by the Kansas Division of Learning Services (DLS) comprised of the following teams: (1) ECSETS, (2) Career Standards and Assessment, (3) Research and Evaluation, and (4) Teacher Licensure and Accreditation. The KSDE staff members from ECSETS are considered Kansas TASN providers. Furthermore, members from each division team are providing school improvement support based on principles aligned with Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. The Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework approach is supported by all teams within DLS and promotes quality instruction for all students and ensures additional supports for subgroups including students with disabilities and English learners.

The KSDE Division of Learning Services also has a dynamic strategic operational plan. This 2015-2018 plan includes vision, mission, core values, processes and procedures for internal professional learning, working across teams and communication methods. Implementation of the DLS strategic operational plan creates opportunities for regular and ongoing communication across division teams. Multiple ECSETS members, including leadership, participate on workgroups as well as the steering committee. Facilitation of the division process is the result of technical assistance provided by the Central Comprehensive Center (C3).

Collaborative discussions with other state agencies about improving the State infrastructure are promoted by partnerships with the following: (1) Kansas Reading Roadmap, (2) Kansas Information Resource Center, (3) the University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning, (4) Pittsburg State University in partnership with Utah State University, (5) American Institutes for Research (AIR), and (6) Keystone Learning Services Education Service Center.

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

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

COMPONENT #2: ELEMENTS OF SUPPORT FOR DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

The Kansas SSIP is composed of three rigorous coherent improvement strategies:

1.0 Strategically realign, reallocate, and leverage current State Education Agency (SEA) policies, organization and infrastructure for increased capacity of district evidence-based practice implementation;

2.0 Design, implement and evaluate an integrated school improvement planning framework, built upon the existing Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (Kansas MTSS), to increase district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities;

3.0 Evaluate the degree to which the state infrastructure supports district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th Grade.

The State will support districts in implementing evidence-based practices through Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 which includes tiered instruction through the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. The KSDE believes that academic achievement and behavior that supports learning are intertwined in such a way that sustainable implementation of evidence-based practices should be implemented simultaneously. Additionally, for the expected level of change to occur and be sustained it must be coordinated at the district level and implemented at the building level with ongoing support. Specifically, OSEP educational environments data indicate Kansas students with disabilities receive the majority of instruction in general education settings. The level of intervention for all students must include special education within a larger instructional context that will impact practices of all providers who are delivering instruction to students with disabilities for meaningful change to occur. While the approach is systemic, the focus of the Kansas SSIP and SIMR are specific to the reading scores of students with disabilities in grades Kindergarten through 5th Grade.

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

To achieve the Kansas SIMR and increase the percentage of students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th Grade who score at grade level benchmark on the AIMSweb reading assessment, the KSDE has funded a five year grant agreement with approximately 18 full time staff members who are dedicated to the selection, training and coaching of districts and buildings in the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. The Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework builds a system to support effective instructional practices for all students, including students with disabilities. As discussed in the Phase I Analysis, the development of this model was informed by implementation science, external evaluations, and data analysis of students with disabilities.

SSIP Implementation Activities

Activities to implement the Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 are designed increase the capacity of the SEA and achieve the expected change in district, school and provider practices. The activities include training and ongoing coaching for district level teams, building level teams, grade level teams, and individual staff for each district involved in the Kansas SSIP for a minimum of three years. The implementation plan for this strategy is guided by the implementation science and ongoing evaluation of Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. Four activities are:

2.1 Establish and fund the Kansas MTSS Project that is charged with implementing the Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0. This project is fully funded by the KSDE to support the implementation of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework and is managed by the KSDE ECSETS Leadership Team.

2.2 Assess and refine materials to ensure effective and efficient training of district personnel in the integrated framework.

2.3 Select, train, and coach the Kansas MTSS State Trainers as a means to increase the capacity of districts for providing sustainable implementation of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework across educational settings.

2.4 Implement the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework training system focusing on districts with demonstrated need to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities, as well as, readiness to implement the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. The training system is driven by implementation science and can be summarized in five steps or phases:

2.4.1. State Level Installation. The initial activity is based on the implementation science driver of selection. This contains activities focused on identifying and training districts to develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive integrated tiered district plan for the implementation of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework from Kindergarten through 5th Grade and ensure readiness for implementation of Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework. Districts are considered for selection upon submission of the *Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework Application* (Attachment 2). The comprehensive application was informed by the principles of implementation science and draws heavily from the Hexagon Tool (Blasé, K., Kiser, L., & Dyke, M., 2013). The Kansas MTSS Project staff review applications and follow up with onsite visits, if necessary, to verify information.

2.4.2. State Level Implementation. Based on readiness, districts selected for participation in annual cohorts are established at the beginning of the school year. Districts not selected for participation receive support from TASN in identifying steps to move toward readiness. Readiness activities will be focused on selection criteria within the district level application.

2.4.3. District Level Installation. Districts spend approximately one year in the installation stage after being selected into a cohort. During that period of time, the Kansas MTSS Project staff deliver training and ongoing coaching to the district and each building within the district. Current district practices are evaluated for evidence-base, implementation fidelity, and fit with district needs. The district and buildings establish structures and systems that support professional learning, as well as, a culture that will enable sustainable implementation. District staff members begin professional learning to refine current practices and/or to learn new evidence-based practices that are necessary for implementation. The installation stage results in the development of a multi-year plan to implement and sustain the district wide Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework.

2.4.4. District Level Initial Implementation. In year two, districts move into an initial implementation stage. This stage typically lasts one year. District staff begin to implement the multi-year plan resulting in instructional practices being systemically used across the district. The Kansas MTSS Project staff provide just in time training as district teams begin working with data and matching interventions with student needs. All training is followed up with onsite coaching helping teams to work more effectively and with individual staff members to ensure practices are being used with fidelity. Implementation fidelity of the district system is monitored on an ongoing basis by the Kansas MTSS Project. To ensure sustainability, local staff members are also taught to monitor system fidelity.

2.4.5. District Level Full Implementation. During the third year in the cohort, districts move into the full implementation stage. A majority of district staff are expected to be using the evidence-based practices proficiently at this point. The Kansas MTSS Project staff continue to monitor fidelity of system implementation and provide ongoing coaching to district leadership. The Kansas MTSS project staff assist with identifying and training in specific areas of the system in need of refinement.

The *Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework Application* (Attachment 2) provides a detailed explanation of the application process, district expectations and readiness tools.

Communication Strategies

Communication methods are shared across Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategies. The activities used to create an effective communication strategy are:

- A. The KSDE establishes the vision and message for the Kansas SSIP work.
- B. The vision and message guide the work of the Kansas MTSS Project staff that provide the integrated framework training and ongoing coaching to districts and buildings.
- C. Kansas MTSS project staff, through the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework, guide the implementation in the districts.
- D. The district communicates the vision and district implementation plan for the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework locally.

Stakeholder Involvement, Barriers and SEA Support

Stakeholder involvement for supporting district implementation of evidence-based practices contained within Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 is done at the local district and community level. Stakeholder involvement is ongoing and woven throughout the work of the installation and implementation stages. This includes a significant amount of input from the educational community involving an iterative process of input and review. Ongoing family engagement training and coaching and parental involvement is provided within the context of the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework implementation. The work is led by TASN staff from the Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC).

The barriers discussed in the Kansas Phase I of the SSIP are being addressed specifically through the activities of: (1) the funding of an expanded Kansas MTSS Project; (2) the application process for becoming part of a Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework cohort; (3) the state level coordination and training, district level implementation, and building level intervention/student impact through the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework; and (4) intensified coaching and monitoring of implementation fidelity.

Each Coherent Improvement Strategy is the work of the SEA which crosses KSDE teams and results in scaling-up consistent, focused, and ongoing coaching to districts to support sustained implementation of evidence-based reading practices to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy implementation aligns with overall KSDE improvement efforts and has full support of the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and School Improvement Coordinator. The KSDE will coalesce around the work that is reflected in the SSIP Coherent Improvement strategies and collaborate to implement projects across KSDE teams and other state agencies to ensure alignment of state and federal programs to sustain district implementation of the SSIP intervention. The alignment of programs, policies, and processes at the SEA will ensure consistent messaging and ongoing support for district school improvement efforts.

Evaluation

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

COMPONENT #3: ELEMENTS OF SSIP EVALUATION

The Kansas SSIP is composed of three rigorous coherent improvement strategies:

1.0 Strategically realign, reallocate, and leverage current State Education Agency (SEA) policies, organization and infrastructure for increased capacity of district evidence-based practice implementation;

2.0 Design, implement and evaluate an integrated school improvement planning framework, built upon the existing Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (Kansas MTSS), to increase district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities;

3.0 Evaluate the degree to which the state infrastructure supports district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th Grade.

The Kansas TASN Evaluation Project, in collaboration with KSDE leadership, designed a multi-year evaluation plan which identifies short- and long-term objectives aligned to the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action (Figure 7, Version 2; Figure 8, Version 2) addressed through the implementation science drivers. Additionally, a working draft of the Kansas SSIP Logic Model (Attachment 3) identifies key stakeholders, strategies, activities as well as short and long term outcomes needed to achieve the SIMR. The evaluation plan will monitor the implementation and outcomes of infrastructure development and support for district implementation of evidence-based practices. Through formative evaluation aligned with implementation science and guided by data-based implementation, the SSIP will impact student achievement, resulting in measurable improvement in the SIMR.

Inputs and Outputs

The evaluation plan for the Kansas SSIP includes short-term and long-term objectives aligned with the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action. As shown in the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action, the alignment of KIAS, the Kansas accountability processes, as well as district training and coaching, will lead to increased knowledge, skills, and collaboration among educators. Evaluation of these inputs and outputs will ensure that the accountability process, district training and coaching meets the needs of educators and adheres to implementation science principles.

- Inputs include vision and priorities of the KSDE ECSETS Leadership Team, allocation of resources, and the Kansas TASN infrastructure.
- Outputs include collaboration strategies, alignment efforts, training, and coaching of district and school leadership teams.

The short-term and long-term objectives included in the evaluation of the Kansas SSIP include short-term outcomes of knowledge, skills, and collaboration and long-term outcomes of sustainable school-wide implementation fidelity with attention to the research on evidence-based instructional practices that will support data-based decision making at the classroom, school, professional development provider, and SEA levels.

- Short-term outcomes include increases in knowledge, skills, and collaboration.
- Long-term outcomes include sustained school-wide implementation of evidence-based instructional practices with fidelity.

The evaluation will measure the impact on achievement of measureable improvement in the SIMR for students with disabilities. Through tiered reading instruction that meets the needs of each student, reading skills as measured by AIMSweb will improve. School teams will analyze these data three times per year to inform and improve instruction. Annual SIMR data will inform inputs and outputs, identifying both areas of success and continued improvement.

Kansas SSIP Measurement Objectives:

The following evaluation outcomes and objectives are used to measure Kansas SSIP implementation effectiveness:

Outcome 3.1 Evaluate the degree to which the state infrastructure supports district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities Kindergarten through 5th grade.

Objective 3.1.1. Assess and measure use of an ongoing feedback loop, ability to identify barriers, correct errors, system responsiveness, and effectiveness of collaboration within the SEA's infrastructure.

Objective 3.1.2. Measure extent to which the coherent improvement strategies are implemented.

Objective 3.1.3. Design and establish principles for monitoring fidelity and performance informed by implementation science and Kansas IDEIA State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) evaluation.

Objective 3.1.4. Utilize guided feedback from schools, districts, and the SEA to help determine implementation and sustained use of evidence-based reading practices over time.

Stakeholder Dissemination and Involvement

Key stakeholders involved in the design of the evaluation for the Kansas SSIP included the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), Kansas TASN professional development providers, districts, and families. Progress and outcomes will be disseminated through an annual evaluation report.

Kansas Special Education Advisory Council. The SEAC guided and informed multiple aspects of the evaluation. In September 2015, the TASN Evaluation Project led a collaborative discussion with the SEAC to introduce the Kansas TASN Program Performance Measures (Attachment 4) and Implementation Science Evidence-Based Professional Development Practices Rubric (Attachment 5). SEAC's feedback guided adjustments to the evaluation.

Progress on the SSIP and evaluation outcomes will be shared with the SEAC twice per year, with feedback informing the implementation of both state infrastructure improvements and support to districts. The discussions and decisions will be analyzed through document review of the SEAC meeting minutes.

State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). The SICC guided and informed aspects of the evaluation such as meeting jointly with SEAC, participation in monthly phone calls and ongoing discussions of the Kansas SSIP for IDEIA Part C and IDEIA Part B.

Kansas TASN Providers. The Kansas TASN professional development providers meet on a quarterly basis. Kansas TASN providers will inform the evaluation process and help in the SSIP dissemination efforts. Progress on the SSIP and evaluation outcomes will be shared with the TASN providers at least twice a year, with feedback informing the implementation of both state infrastructure improvements and support to districts. The discussions and decisions will be analyzed through document review of the TASN Leadership Team meeting minutes.

District Level. District feedback on implementation of the SSIP will be obtained through a variety of methods. Feedback on TASN will be directly obtained from district leadership annually. This feedback will guide refinement to the system. The success of the refinements will be evaluated through analysis of meeting minutes, district document review, and accountability system features.

District personnel participating in Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework structuring and implementation training will provide feedback on the training and coaching provided by the Kansas MTSS State Trainers. Qualitative and quantitative data will be analyzed and reported to the trainers following each training event. The trainers meet monthly to discuss district feedback and make adjustments to the training and coaching content and process.

Information gathered from district interviews and focus groups are also used to evaluate the implementation. The focus groups will provide feedback pertaining to the usefulness, effort, and timeliness of data to inform local-level decision making. Modifications to the evaluation measures will be a direct result of the feedback.

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

Family and Community. Families will inform the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP. For districts implementing the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework, a statewide family stakeholder group facilitated by the Kansas Parent Information and Resource Center (KPIRC) and Families Together, Inc., (which is the Kansas Parent Training and Information Center) will provide feedback on the evaluation of the effectiveness of family engagement. The *Leading by Convening: A Blueprint for Authentic Engagement* (Cashman, Linehan, Purcell, Rosser, Schultz, & Skalski, 2014) is being used to inform this work. The evaluation will also measure the level of interaction between KSDE and this stakeholder group. The *Family Engagement in Kansas MTSS Survey* (Attachment 6) will be used to determine the implementation of the *PTA National Standards for Family School Partnership* family engagement standards. The survey was developed through a collaboration between the Kansas TASN providers and KPIRC. This survey will be used with each district participating in the Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework trainings. Survey results will be used to inform future training and coaching priorities for each district.

Methods to Collect and Analyze Evaluation Data

The methods to be used directly align with the Kansas TASN evaluation outcome domains: (a) participants increase awareness, knowledge, and skills; (b) administrators and supervisors create conditions that support implementation; (c) participants implement evidence-based practices with fidelity; (d) students and children improve academic, behavioral, and social outcomes; and (e) schools and organizations sustain implementation with fidelity. The evaluation of the Kansas SSIP will be conducted by the Kansas TASN Evaluation Project staff members. Quantitative and qualitative methods will be utilized to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the Kansas SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the Kansas SIMR.

State-Level. To measure improvements in the state infrastructure, methods will include using the *ORID Structured Interview Protocol* (Attachment 7) with KSDE leadership to determine progress in collaboration strategies, alignment efforts, and implementation of the coherent improvement strategies. A document analysis of collaborative products, tools, and resources will be used to determine the extent to which KSDE provides a common message and expectations to districts. Districts administration interviews and surveys will be used to determine the extent to which the state infrastructure is meeting the needs of districts. The Kansas TASN Leadership Team and work group meeting minutes will be reviewed to determine outcomes of collaborative efforts and the ongoing use of data to inform infrastructure refinement.

District-Level. The Kansas Evaluation Project will measure improvements in district implementation of evidence-based practices through implementation of the coherent improvement strategies. Methods will include evaluating the Kansas MTSS projects performance on using the TASN Program Measures. The *Implementation Science Evidence-Based Professional Development Practice Rubric* (Attachment 5) that rates the project's performance in following key practices related to selection, training, coaching, facilitative administration and performance assessment is one tool. Fidelity of implementation will be assessed in each school implementing Kansas MTSS Integrated Framework through the practice profiles (i.e., checklist of core implementation components in place; observed by the MTSS trainers), document analysis (i.e., key structuring documents developed by the school that outline core, supplement, and tertiary supports as well as decision rules), implementation surveys (i.e., self-rated surveys of individual implementation completed by all instructional staff and administrators within each school), on-site observations, and stakeholder surveys (e.g., the *Family Engagement in Kansas MTSS Survey*). The TASN Evaluation Project will determine how the data from these measures was used to inform decisions at the school, district, provider, and state levels. Structured interviews with Kansas MTSS State Trainers/coaches and document analysis of Kansas TASN Leadership Team meetings will be analyzed to determine mid-course adjustments that were informed by data. See Attachment 4: *TASN Program Performance Measures* for additional information on overarching TASN evaluation indicators.

Use of Evaluation Data

The State uses evaluation data from multiple sources to examine the effectiveness of the implementation, measure the progress toward achieving intended improvements, and to make modifications of the Kansas SSIP as necessary. In Kansas improvements at both the state and local level are done through the use of a problem-solving approach referred to as the *Self-Correcting Feedback Loop* (Attachment 8). By using the Self-Correcting Feedback Loop, school and district teams are provided timely data and guided toward data-informed decisions at the student, grade, content area, school, and district levels. Trainers and coaches emphasize practices that improve knowledge, skills, and implementation within districts. The Kansas TASN Leadership Team analyzes aggregate student, district, and provider data to inform systems improvements. These data, along with state infrastructure alignment data, will be analyzed, reported, and discussed at least twice per year.

Formative and summative evaluation data are used to determine strengths and areas of continued improvement. The KSDE ECSETS and the Kansas TASN Leadership will examine input and output data to address continued or newly-identified areas of improvement. These modifications will be implemented by KSDE and the Kansas MTSS trainers to better support school professionals to implement evidence-based practices that improve the reading of students by meeting each student's needs through a tiered model. Successes and modifications to training, coaching, and technical assistance will be documented through meeting minutes.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

STATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT NEEDS

To effectively implement and sustain the Kansas SSIP, the state will draw upon an array of in-state providers and existing national

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

partners to support the SEA and districts. Kansas will remain informed and engaged through utilization of resources offered by the national technical assistance centers matched to the state identified needs. Kansas will continue to utilize existing customized technical assistance as determined by the SEA. For example, the support initiated by Kansas with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the NCSI Systems Alignment Cross-State Learning Collaborative, and the State Personnel Development Grant Evaluator Network. Through the infrastructure development of the SSIP, the capacity of the state, including the technical assistance providers, will be increased. In addition, there will be continued collaboration and support from all teams within the agency and dialog with stakeholders to improve alignment and provide opportunities for feedback.

National support to aid in effective SSIP implementation and reporting would be:

- Availability of videos from Active Implementation (AI) Hub that are downloadable for use with professional development in areas without reliable internet access. The videos are developed and maintained by the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP) and the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN).
- Release of the proposed State Capacity-Building Grants for SEA competition.

REFERENCES

Blasé, K., Kiser, L., & Van Dyke, M. (2013). *The hexagon tool: Exploring context*. Chapel Hill: National Implementation Research Network, FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina.

Cashman, J., Linehan, P., Purcell, L., Rosser, M., Schultz, S., & Skalski, S. (2014). *Leading by convening: A blueprint for authentic engagement*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Phase III submissions should include:

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

A. Summary of Phase 3

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

The Kansas SSIP Phase III, Year 2 Summary is included in the attached pdf.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

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

The Kansas SSIP Phase III, Year 2 Progress is included in the attached pdf.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

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

The Kansas SSIP Phase III, Year 2 Data on Implementation and Outcomes are included in the attached pdf.

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

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

The Kansas SSIP Phase III, Year 2 Data Quality Issues are included in the attached pdf.

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

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

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

The Kansas SSIP Phase III, Year 2 Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements is included in the attached pdf.

F. Plans for Next Year

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

The Kansas SSIP Phase III, Year 2 Plans for Next Year are included in the attached pdf.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Kerry Haag

Title: Assistant Director

Email: khaag@ksde.org

Phone: 785-291-3098