

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

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Kansas



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

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 OSEP, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act, and state statutes and regulations. 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, behavioral, and social outcomes for students with disabilities

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 and Special Education and Title Services Teams, 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 SETS 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 TASN information is available at www.ksdetasn.org.

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 OSEP for professional development, guidance, and collaboration in order to continually improve 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 educational results and functional outcomes 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

Stakeholder Involvement

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 six 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) TASN providers; (5) the ESEA Advisory Council; and (6) the Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, and higher education.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

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 C.F.R. § 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). The FFY 2017 performance of each district on the indicator targets is available to the public at the KSDE website http://datacentral.ksde.org/sped_rpts.aspx. A complete copy of the FFY 2017 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> and the OSEP SPP APR Public landing page <https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr/publicView>. 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.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports did not contain, as specified in the OSEP Response, all of the required information. With its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2016. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Kansas has publicly reported on the FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA and those reports contain the required information. Specifically, Kansas has reported on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan for Indicator 8.

The weblink demonstrating that Kansas has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2016 is http://datacentral.ksde.org/sped_rpts.aspx. In addition, Kansas describes in this FFY 2018 SPP/APR, how and where the state reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each LEA located in the state on the targets in the SPP/APR in the section labeled "Reporting to the Public."

Intro - OSEP Response

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

Intro - Required Actions

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

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	85.70%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%
Data	77.77%	76.71%	77.29%	77.52%	78.37%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	85.75%	85.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,808
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,759
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	80.02%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,808	4,759	78.37%	85.75%	80.02%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

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

The Kansas four-year graduation cohort rate is 80.02%.

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

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? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	2.46%
----------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	2.42%	2.42%	2.40%	2.40%	2.38%
Data	2.49%	2.72%	2.75%	2.57%	2.66%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.32%	2.32%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,337

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	42
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	683
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	17

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

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

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

For FFY 2018 Kansas chose the OSEP Option 2 using the same data source and measurement that was used for the FFY 2017 APR submitted in February 2019. 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 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
421	17,852	2.66%	2.32%	2.36%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

Any student who leaves school and does not enroll in another school or program that culminates in a high school diploma. The students reported by the LEA as exiting under the following exit categories count as a dropout: discontinued schooling, moved within the United States - 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 the dropout category.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=		98.32%	98.32%	98.32%	98.32%
A	Overall	97.10%	Actual		98.43%	97.78%	97.03%	97.68%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=		98.31%	98.31%	98.31%	98.31%
A	Overall	97.20%	Actual		98.43%	97.74%	97.01%	97.88%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.34%	98.34%
Math	A >=	Overall	98.33%	98.33%

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 such as 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 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	35,868	35,106	97.68%	98.34%	97.88%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
							Target	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	35,879	35,102	97.88%	98.33%	97.83%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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 https://datacentral.ksde.org/sped_rpts.aspx.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State provided to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). To view this data, please go to the Kansas Building Report Card site at <http://ksreportcard.ksde.org/default.aspx>. Click on the button titled "View State Results." In the upper left corner, select "Performance Indicators," then from the drop-down menu select "Participation Summary Report". The state totals will pre-populate. To view district-level data, select a district. To view building-level data, select a building. To view type and subject of assessment in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f), on the right side, click on the drop-down menu in the "Selections Subject" box. Options include all assessments, general with accommodations, DLM (alternate assessment). The State has included in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR this same Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

3B - OSEP Response

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

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=		15.36%	15.36%	16.96%	18.56%
A	Overall	15.36%	Actual		15.36%	15.39%	14.20%	13.63%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=		10.85%	10.85%	11.75%	12.65%
A	Overall	10.85%	Actual		10.85%	11.61%	11.35%	10.84%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	20.74%	20.74%
Math	A >=	Overall	14.47%	14.47%

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 such as 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 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
-------	------------	--	---	---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------	----------

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	35,106	4,819	13.63%	20.74%	13.73%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	35,102	3,877	10.84%	14.47%	11.04%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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 https://datacentral.ksde.org/sped_rpts.aspx.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%
----------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.00%	0.70%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	286	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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:

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 data)

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

Kansas did not identify a district with a significant discrepancy and is not required to do the review under 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). To select an accurate answer Kansas would need an N/A option.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.35%
----------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.36%	0.00%	0.00%	0.35%	0.35%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPPI/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	286	0.35%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

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

Kansas did not identify a district with a significant discrepancy and is not required to do the review under 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). To select an accurate answer Kansas would need an N/A option

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2017 were corrected and verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has verified, based upon updated data through onsite interviews and observations of the implementation of revised district procedures, that each district with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 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

The state did not identify any individual cases of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response**4B- Required Actions**

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%
A	59.30%	Data	68.61%	69.32%	68.91%	68.93%	68.47%
B	2005	Target <=	7.35%	7.35%	7.35%	7.34%	7.32%
B	8.12%	Data	6.93%	6.72%	6.97%	7.41%	7.26%
C	2005	Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.48%	2.46%
C	2.44%	Data	2.30%	2.27%	2.20%	2.25%	2.32%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	68.00%	68.00%
Target B <=	7.30%	7.30%
Target C <=	2.43%	2.43%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	63,406
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	43,645
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than	4,512

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)		40% of the day	
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,239
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	154
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	90

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

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	43,645	63,406	68.47%	68.00%	68.83%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,512	63,406	7.26%	7.30%	7.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements <i>[c1+c2+c3]</i>	1,483	63,406	2.32%	2.43%	2.34%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	38.30%	38.40%	38.50%	38.75%	38.91%
A	38.66%	Data	38.40%	37.76%	37.23%	37.79%	37.90%
B	2011	Target <=	33.30%	33.21%	32.75%	32.50%	31.99%
B	32.24%	Data	33.21%	34.04%	33.53%	34.92%	34.58%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	39.00%	39.00%
Target B <=	31.75%	31.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	12,105
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,689

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,870
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	22
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,689	12,105	37.90%	39.00%	38.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,892	12,105	34.58%	31.75%	32.15%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	86.50%	86.50%	86.50%	86.65%	86.75%

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	85.93%	Data	88.06%	87.74%	88.13%	89.42%	90.68%
A2	2008	Target >=	66.40%	66.40%	66.40%	66.60%	66.80%
A2	65.16%	Data	66.73%	65.61%	65.52%	63.34%	65.94%
B1	2008	Target >=	86.45%	86.45%	86.45%	86.47%	86.49%
B1	86.38%	Data	87.42%	86.78%	87.53%	89.67%	89.06%
B2	2008	Target >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.75%
B2	63.60%	Data	63.38%	63.90%	63.31%	61.79%	63.03%
C1	2008	Target >=	87.40%	87.40%	87.40%	87.60%	87.80%
C1	86.24%	Data	88.15%	87.66%	88.61%	88.77%	90.56%
C2	2008	Target >=	78.80%	78.80%	78.80%	79.00%	79.25%
C2	76.79%	Data	79.13%	77.89%	77.62%	75.76%	78.02%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2 >=	67.00%	67.00%
Target B1 >=	86.50%	86.50%
Target B2 >=	64.00%	64.00%
Target C1 >=	88.00%	88.00%
Target C2 >=	79.50%	79.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,013

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	0.17%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	335	8.35%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,128	28.11%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,519	37.85%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,024	25.52%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the	2,647	2,989	90.68%	87.00%	88.56%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,543	4,013	65.94%	67.00%	63.37%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	5	0.12%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	307	7.65%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,203	29.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,510	37.63%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	988	24.62%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,713	3,025	89.06%	86.50%	89.69%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,498	4,013	63.03%	64.00%	62.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	11	0.27%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	244	6.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	658	16.40%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,621	40.39%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,479	36.86%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	2,279	2,534	90.56%	88.00%	89.94%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.							
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.	3,100	4,013	78.02%	79.50%	77.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	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 LEA 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/no)

YES

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

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

YES

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

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	33.00%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.25%	66.40%
Data	66.58%	73.37%	82.98%	71.25%	60.32%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	66.50%	66.50%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
249	356	60.32%	66.50%	69.94%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

8,850

Percentage of respondent parents

4.02%

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.

Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The results are reliable and valid because a stratified representative sample of parents is selected to complete the survey. Care is taken to ensure that the strata are mutually exclusive. Every element in the population is assigned to only one stratum. The strata are also collectively exhaustive: no population element is excluded. This ensures the representativeness of the sample by reducing sampling error. Each year, the representativeness of the surveys is 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 is done to determine if any groups are under-or over-represented. Generally this comparison indicates the results are representative by race/ethnicity, age of student, and disability.

Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
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 analyzed 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-five percent of parent respondents had a child with a race/ethnicity of white, whereas 65% of children with disabilities are white. Thirteen percent of parent respondents had a child with a race/ethnicity of Hispanic, whereas 17% of the children with disabilities are Hispanic. Seventeen percent of parent respondents had a child with a learning disability, whereas 34% of children with disabilities have a learning disability. Twenty-two percent of parent respondents had a child with autism, whereas six percent 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 Kansas. When examining the items and survey scales, there were no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity or by primary disability. When examining the response rate by local education agency (LEA), parents from a wide variety of LEA's 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 survey. Kansas will continue to ensure the response data are representative of the children receiving special education services in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

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

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%
----------	------	-------

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

132

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	154	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 in special education and related services; 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 in special education and related services; and A weighted risk ratio >3.00.

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 in a "prominent" racial/ethnic group (Hispanics, Blacks, and 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right) \times 100 \right]$

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%
----------	------	-------

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

199

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	87	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 in a specific disability category; 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; at least 30 students in the comparison group in a specific disability category; 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.

KSDE notifies the district that it has disproportionate representation and provides the district with the required Kansas Self-Assessment Tool. This tool requires the district to review its policies, practices and procedures specific to the identified racial and ethnic group and disability category. The district completes and submits the Kansas Self-Assessment Tool data to KSDE and the KSDE team reviews submitted information to determine whether the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

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 in a "prominent" racial/ethnic group (Hispanics, Blacks, and 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 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	98.40%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.77%	99.58%	99.86%	99.74%	99.66%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,726	2,720	99.66%	100%	99.78%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

6

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 beyond timeline: 5 to 29 school days

Reasons for delay:

Difficulty scheduling meeting

Staff error

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The State's timeline for initial evaluations is 60 school days. The State exception is if the parent consents in writing to extend the timeline. K.A.R. 91-40-8(f)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The Kansas 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 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2017 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. KSDE has verified, based on review of updated student file data submitted, that each district with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 data reported for this indicator is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements and 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 findings of noncompliance for FFY 2017 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The KSDE has verified through a review of data submitted in an authenticated database system that each district with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 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 OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	72.00%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.20%	99.89%	99.85%	99.52%	99.69%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,393
---	-------

b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	35
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,237
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	70
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	48
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,237	2,240	99.69%	100%	99.87%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
3

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: 2-62

Reasons for Delay:

Inclement weather delayed meeting.

Staff error

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2017 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) verified, based on a review of updated student file data submitted on children transitioning from Part C to Part B data that each district with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 data reported for this indicator is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement 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 findings of noncompliance for FFY 2017 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 with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

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

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	99.84%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.51%	99.73%	99.74%	99.33%	99.52%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,457	2,478	99.52%	100%	99.15%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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
If yes, 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?	NO

If no, please explain

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2017 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The 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 2017 data reported for this indicator is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, 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 2017 were corrected and correction verified within one year of notification of noncompliance. The 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 2017 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

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

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

I. Definitions

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

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

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	33.00%	35.50%	38.00%	41.00%	45.00%
A	48.60%	Data	33.33%	36.43%	28.25%	42.67%	32.32%
B	2009	Target >=	60.60%	61.60%	63.20%	65.60%	69.60%
B	72.60%	Data	60.61%	63.93%	54.25%	62.21%	56.10%
C	2009	Target >=	73.59%	74.59%	76.59%	79.09%	81.09%
C	83.20%	Data	73.59%	77.14%	67.75%	72.96%	75.00%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	48.65%	48.65%
Target B >=	72.65%	72.65%
Target C >=	83.30%	83.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	319
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	95
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	94
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)	11
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).	41

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	95	319	32.32%	48.65%	29.78%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	189	319	56.10%	72.65%	59.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	241	319	75.00%	83.30%	75.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	An examination of state-level data for the indicator suggests the slippage may be attributed to a lower response rate and an increase in sample size.

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.

Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The design of the sampling methodology will yield valid and reliable estimates because Kansas districts are categorized into 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 leavers from the districts within each cohort.

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

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

The representativeness of the Indicator 14 results was analyzed by examining the demographic characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of leaver to determine if one group was more likely to respond than another group. This analysis showed that White leavers (27%) were significantly more likely to respond than Hispanic leavers (16%) or African American leavers (13%). Leavers who had graduated with a diploma (25%) were significantly more likely to respond than Leavers who had dropped out (7%).

KSDE believes the results are generally representative for several reasons. First, there were no significant differences by gender or by primary disability. Second, leavers from districts across the state responded; so, results are representative by geography. Third, responses of Hispanic leavers were not significantly different from responses of White leavers.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

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

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	6
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	35.00%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%
Data	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%	75.00%	55.56%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	37.00%	40.00%	37.00%	40.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	6	55.56%	37.00%	40.00%	50.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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

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

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	11
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As a result of multiple meetings, broad representative stakeholders provided input and feedback on the indicator status and results.

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	75.00%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	76.94% - 76.94%	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00% - 80.00%
Data	75.00%	80.00%	70.00%	87.50%	76.19%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	77.00%	80.00%	77.00%	80.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	7	11	76.19%	77.00%	80.00%	90.91%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



FFY2018 Kansas Year
4 SSIP Report 121219

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Kerry A. Haag

Title:

Assistant Director, Special Education and Title Services

Email:

khaag@ksde.org

Phone:

785 291 3097

Submitted on:

04/28/20 1:29:38 PM

ED Attachements:



KS-B Dispute
Resolution 2018-19.p



KS-2020DataRubricP
artB.pdf



2020 HTDMD Part
B.pdf



ks-resultsmatrix-202
0b.pdf



KS-aprltr-2020b.pdf

**FFY 2018 Kansas Phase III, Year 4 State Systemic Improvement Plan
Indicator 17 Data and Overview**

A. Summary of Phase III, Year 4

The FFY 2018 Kansas Phase III, Year 4 submission is organized according to the report outline provided by the Office of Special Education Programs. The components of the report are:

- A. Summary of FFY 2018 Phase III, Year 4
- B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP
- C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes
- D. Data Quality Issues
- E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements
- F. Plans for Next Year

The following Kansas report includes data and analyses consistent with the Kansas State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Indicator 17 FFY 2018 Phase III, Year 4 requirements. The report includes the Theory of Action and evaluation plan that outlines the Kansas cohort districts' progress toward meeting the short-term and long-term objectives for implementation of the Kansas SSIP. The Kansas report also includes progress in achieving the State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for students with disabilities (Table 1). The FFY 2018 Phase III, Year 4 Kansas Report outlines data-based justifications for proceeding with implementation activities. Data verify that Kansas has focused efforts in order to support systemic improvement in the area of reading skills for children kindergarten through fifth grade, specifically students with disabilities, as stated in the Kansas SIMR. Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved in decision making are included.

Appendices:

- A. Kansas SSIP Theory of Action
- B. Kansas SSIP Logic Model
- C. Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan
- D. Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy Activity Timeline and Status
- E. Glossary of Terms

Table 1

Kansas State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=		29.95%	30.00%	27.52%	28.50%	29.50%	29.50%
Data	29.95%*	24.41%	26.37%	27.52%**	31.11%	30.25%	

*Baseline

** Baseline Re-Established

The target was met. The FFY 2018 percentage of 30.25% of students with disabilities kindergarten through fifth grade reading at benchmark or above is a slight decrease from the FFY 2017 percentage of 31.11% but an improvement over the 27.52% reported for FFY 2016, the 26.37% reported for FFY 2015, and the 24.41% reported for FFY 2014. Additionally, 34.9% of students with disabilities served by SIMR cohort districts exceeded the expected grade-level growth for all students during FFY 2018, which is an essential factor in allowing students who

are not reaching grade-level benchmark to close the achievement gap. It is expected that 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 in FFY 2019. The 2019 target has been set at 29.50%.

Theory of Action, Logic Model, SIMR, Coherent Improvement Strategies, and Infrastructure Improvement Strategies

As described in the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action (Appendix A), Kansas SSIP Logic Model (Appendix B), and Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan (Appendix C), the Kansas SSIP addressed three coherent improvement strategies to achieve the SIMR during the FFY 2018 reporting period:

- Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 focused on infrastructure development through strategically realigning, reallocating, and leveraging current State Education Agency (SEA) policies, organization, and infrastructure for increased capacity of districts to implement evidence-based practices.
- Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 focused on supporting the implementation of evidence-based practices through designing, implementing, and evaluating an integrated school improvement-planning framework built upon the existing Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (Kansas MTSS) and Alignment. These changes increased district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities.
- Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 evaluated the degree to which the state infrastructure supported district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities kindergarten through 5th grade.

Evidence-Based Practices and Evaluation Overview

During FFY 2018, the timelines for Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0, Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, and Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 were followed. Evaluation measures were refined and implemented as part of the Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) utilization-focused evaluation process. The principle activities and evaluation plan were fully implemented, and the results of the short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes for each of the three coherent improvement strategies were reported.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) made gains in infrastructure development and alignment that increased the capacity of districts to implement evidence-based practices. The specific activities and outcomes reported include integration within the Kansas ESEA Consolidated Plan, implementation of the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) model, unified infrastructure, and aligned utilization-focused evaluation. The KSDE used principles of *Leading by Convening* (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage stakeholders through each phase of the process and continues to do so on an ongoing basis.

Evidence-based practice implementation within Kansas MTSS and Alignment districts was apparent. These practices include the provision of evidence-based core and intervention curricula, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and promoting

family engagement. During FFY 2018, leadership teams from the SIMR cohort districts participated in ongoing implementation training to develop and implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment. The districtwide trainings included participants from early childhood settings, elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. Data are reported on the short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes from these districts. While the SIMR focused specifically on the reading achievement of students with disabilities in kindergarten through 5th grade, Kansas MTSS and Alignment holistically supports sustainable, districtwide implementation of an integrated reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional model from early childhood through graduation. Within the framework, each student, specifically students with disabilities, received the instruction and interventions necessary to improve reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes.

Changes to Implementation and Improvement Strategies

The implementation timeline and evaluation of the coherent improvement strategies are on target. There is not a need to modify the SSIP implementation plan at this time since the data feedback loops, including stakeholder engagement, are in place and operating as planned.

For students to reach grade-level benchmark on a Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM), both fluency consistent with the grade-level criteria and 95% accuracy must be achieved. When students struggle learning 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, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018, students with disabilities in grades two through five substantially improved in achievement of the 95% accuracy criterion (Table 2). Developing interventions focused on students' needs resulted in individual student growth. With both improvements in Kansas SIMR data and grade-level reading accuracy data, stakeholders determined the intervention to be effective.

Table 2

Percentage of students with disabilities grades two through five achieving 95% accuracy in reading.

Reporting Year	Fall	Spring	Improvement
FFY 2016	42.2%	65.2%	23.0%
FFY 2017	38.7%	71.8%	34.1%
FFY 2018	39.1%	63.5%	24.4%

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

SSIP Implementation Progress

Progress for implementing the Kansas SSIP is on track and presented in Appendix D as the Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy Activity Timeline and Status. All activities in the three coherent improvement strategies have been implemented as planned.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 focused on improving the infrastructure. Notable accomplishments and outputs included full implementation of the expanded TASN; realignment of the TASN priorities, operating principles, and scopes of work; and allocation of resources

based on state needs and input from stakeholders. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs have been integrated within the Kansas ESEA Consolidated Plan, the KESA model, and the Kansas State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). Activities that will continue for sustainability are: monitoring the delivery of professional development and technical assistance, facilitating communication and collaboration, and aligning resources across the KSDE and TASN providers.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 concentrated on the implementation of evidence-based practices. The expanded TASN system fully implemented the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project in FFY 2015. Implementation was continuously sustained and scaled up through FFY 2018. Additional project members were hired and trained each year, and Kansas MTSS and Alignment materials were assessed and refined to ensure alignment with KESA, the state system for accrediting schools. Ongoing work focuses on providing training and support to districts implementing Kansas MTSS and Alignment with fidelity. During FFY 2016, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project provided intensive coaching in implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment structures to 18 Kansas school districts encompassing 87 buildings and 32,255 students, including 5,460 students with disabilities. During FFY 2017, this expanded to 31 Kansas school districts encompassing 266 buildings and 128,604 students, including 18,501 students with disabilities. In FFY 2018, this expanded to 43 Kansas school districts encompassing 307 buildings and 140,075 students, including 20,954 students with disabilities.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 focused on evaluation of the Kansas SSIP. All of the identified activities have been implemented and sustained across multiple years. Evaluation data demonstrate progress, including the development and sustainability of feedback loops and the evaluation of implementation, progress, and fidelity.

SSIP Implementation Progress in Stakeholder Involvement

The KSDE used principles of *Leading by Convening* (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage stakeholders through each phase of the process and continues to do so on an ongoing basis. Stakeholders from the local and state levels were intentionally informed of the SSIP implementation and provided a voice in decision making. Stakeholders are represented by persons with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, teachers, principals, superintendents, higher education faculty, state school staff members, correctional facility staff members, vocational rehabilitation representatives, and other state agencies. Organizations represented by stakeholders include the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, the Kansas Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), the Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC), the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project, the Kansas Learning Network, and the KESA Advisory Council. Additionally, stakeholders include multiple internal stakeholders from the KSDE Office of the Commissioner, Division of Learning Services, and Special Education and Title Services teams.

Involvement in state-level workgroups, conference participation, and advisory council membership informed stakeholders of ongoing SSIP implementation. Stakeholders informed decisions by providing input, providing feedback, and participating in decision-making groups. Stakeholders have been actively involved in SSIP implementation decision making by co-presenting at conferences and workshops, advising and assisting with revision of training content

and coaching processes, and providing direct feedback data for use in the SSIP evaluation. Numerous stakeholders, including district personnel and the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, informed and approved the FFY 2016 revised Kansas SIMR statement, baseline, and targets. The comprehensive improvement strategy outcomes in Section C of this report describe specific examples of stakeholder engagement activities. Detailed stakeholder engagement results, at both the state and local levels, are located in outcome sections 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2b, 2c, and 2g.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

Monitoring and Measuring of Outputs

The KSDE staff monitored and measured the Kansas SSIP outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan. Through the previous leadership of Colleen Riley and current leadership of Bert Moore, Directors of the KSDE Special Education and Title Services team, the Kansas SSIP operates within an aligned framework at both the SEA and district level.

The KSDE SPP/APR committee, including the SSIP workgroup, meets monthly and is responsible for the coordination, monitoring, and evaluation of the SSIP improvement activities and achievement of the SIMR. Members of the workgroup draft reports in compliance with OSEP Indicator 17 reporting requirements. Multiple groups provide data for the reports:

- The larger KSDE SPP/APR committee provides monthly progress and feedback data.
- The Special Education Advisory Council provides quarterly feedback.
- Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers working with the SIMR cohort districts serve as ad hoc members to the SSIP workgroup.
- TASN Coordination and Evaluation project members serve on the SPP/APR committee and SSIP workgroup.

Additionally, various members of the KSDE SSIP workgroup periodically participate in and present at a variety of professional learning opportunities. Forums include the online SPDG/SSIP community of practice, the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Systems Alignment Collaborative, and other OSEP-sponsored meetings and conferences.

Implementation and Outcomes of Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0: Infrastructure Development

The Kansas SSIP Theory of Action (Appendix A) identifies the results of Phase I data analysis, including the coherent improvement strategies and state-identified measurable result. These strategies are transferred to the Kansas SSIP Logic Model (Appendix B) where outcomes are delineated and labeled with the respective improvement strategy. Each outcome from the Logic Model is transferred to the Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan (Appendix C), aligned using the outcome number (e.g., 1a, 2c). In the Evaluation Plan, associated indicators and measures for each outcome are provided. Following the table, each measure is described with the timeline for data collection. The evaluation plan addresses data management and analyses to show progress toward achieving the intended outcomes as described next.

Short-Term Outcomes: Knowledge, Skills, and Collaboration

Outcome 1a. KSDE staff and TASN providers demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment. The knowledge and skills necessary to develop the infrastructure that facilitates the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment were demonstrated. Implementation included the alignment of state policies and priorities necessary to support comprehensive school improvement as well collaboratively making data-based decisions (Outcomes 1b, 1c, and 1d). This increased the capacity of Kansas districts to provide holistic, sustainable, districtwide implementation of an integrated reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional model from early childhood through graduation.

Kansas MTSS and Alignment is designed to increase district capacity to implement evidence-based practices that improve reading results for students with disabilities kindergarten through 5th grade. The practices within Kansas MTSS and Alignment include provision of evidence-based core and intervention curricula, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement.

The following events were important for increasing knowledge, developing shared understanding, and collaborating professionally in support of Kansas MTSS and Alignment implementation and the Kansas SSIP.

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment Symposium. The annual Kansas MTSS and Alignment Symposium ensures that KSDE staff, TASN providers, and stakeholders learn together and maintain a shared vision for the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment and evidence-based practices. In FFY 2018, 1,351 individuals registered for the Symposium, representing a broad group of stakeholders. Specifically, 16 KSDE staff members, 41 TASN providers (including 22 members of the Kansas MTSS and Alignment staff and the KPIRC Director), 1,120 district personnel (including 84 educators from the SIMR cohort districts), 72 personnel from other educational agencies (e.g., cooperatives, service centers, interlocals, private schools), four university employees, three educational business leaders, a member of the Kansas State Board of Education, and 94 education professionals from other states learned together at this skill-development institute.

The Symposium hosted 92 sessions to assist educators in delivering evidence-based instructional practices within a tiered framework. Four of the sessions were led by Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers and eight were led by districts working with the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project. Other presenters included national experts in the areas of reading, math, behavior/social-emotional learning, collective teacher efficacy, leadership, and mental health. Evaluation data (N=644) indicated that participants found the session topics to be relevant and useful, giving an average rating of 4.69 on a scale from 1 (*Poor*) to 5 (*Excellent*). Additionally, participants rated aspects of the conference on a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Evaluation data are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Kansas MTSS and Alignment Symposium Evaluation Data.

Evaluation Items	Average Ratings (Scale 1-5)
I understand how the content/practice is intended to improve outcomes for children and youth.	3.96
I will use the content or implement the practice(s) from this conference.	3.95
Overall, the training was of high quality.	3.99

The KSDE Summer Leadership Conference. In addition to the shared learning at the Kansas MTSS and Alignment Symposium, KSDE and TASN hosted the KSDE Summer Leadership Conference. The Kansas PTI and each TASN project, including Kansas MTSS and Alignment and KPIRC, hosted individual booths in the TASN Marketplace. The purpose of the Marketplace was to provide a space to exchange information with district leadership regarding the services and resources offered by each TASN project. In FFY 2018, 421 participants attended the conference, including numerous stakeholder groups. A breakdown of the attendees included 32 KSDE staff members, 57 TASN providers (including 21 Kansas MTSS and Alignment staff members), 201 district personnel (including five personnel from the SIMR cohort districts), 99 personnel from other educational agencies, 30 college/university staff members, and two representatives of the Kansas PTI. Thirty-eight of Kansas' 39 (97%) special education cooperatives/interlocals were represented at the FFY 2017 conference, and special education representatives were present for 31 of the 33 districts (94%) that do not use a cooperative or interlocal for special education services.

The KSDE Summer Leadership Conference included 31 sessions that provided information about state priorities and evidence-based instructional practices. KSDE staff and TASN providers jointly presented four sessions, KSDE staff led 16 sessions, TASN providers led six sessions, and members of other entities provided five sessions. Evaluation data (N=187) indicated that participants found the session topics to be relevant and useful, giving an average rating of 4.17 on a scale from 1 (*Poor*) to 5 (*Excellent*). Additionally, participants rated aspects of the conference on a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Evaluation data are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
KSDE Summer Leadership Conference Evaluation Data.

Evaluation Items	Average Ratings (scale 1-5)
I understand how the content/practice is intended to improve outcomes for children and youth.	3.88
I left the conference with tools or functional methods to transfer my learning to practice.	3.68
Overall, the training was of high quality.	3.82

TASN Quarterly Meetings. Full-day, face-to-face TASN Quarterly Meetings were held during FFY 2018. Two key goals of these meetings were (1) to build coherence among KSDE

staff and TASN providers and (2) to facilitate collaboration that leads to the effective and efficient use of human capital. Attendance at each meeting averaged 18 KSDE staff, 15 Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, and 44 other TASN providers. Additionally, meetings were attended by leadership from the Kansas PTI and the KPIRC. Professional learning during FFY 2018 built upon previous efforts. During FFY 2015, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers presented an overview of Kansas MTSS and Alignment and explained its alignment to the work of other TASN projects and to various state and federal laws and initiatives. Through a series of performance-based activities embedded within the presentation, participants were prompted to reflect on and discuss the unique features of Kansas MTSS and Alignment that meet or exceed the requirements of state and federal laws. In FFY 2016, topics discussed in detail at the TASN Quarterly Meetings included:

- How the work of the TASN providers supports the Kansas State Board of Education vision and each KESA indicator;
- How TASN projects could collaborate to support districts' KESA self-assessment and implementation of evidence-based practices that address the KESA indicators;
- Opportunities to serve on KESA Outside Visitation Teams;
- Collaboratively supporting the needs of schools eligible for ESEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement;
- TASN website features that facilitate collaboration (e.g., ability to view the technical assistance provided to each district);
- Stakeholder feedback instruments that can be used across projects (e.g., *MTSS Family Engagement Survey*); and
- Identification of overlap and potential duplication of provider efforts.

In FFY 2017, topics discussed in detail at the TASN Quarterly Meetings included:

- Updates and information from KSDE staff and outside experts on the five Kansas State Board of Education outcomes (i.e., Kindergarten Readiness, Individual Plans of Study, Social-Emotional Growth, High School Graduation, and Postsecondary Success);
- An overview of each TASN project presented by project staff;
- The 2017-2022 Kansas SPDG, focusing on integrating trauma-informed school mental health into MTSS structures;
- Aligning efforts around coaching models used by TASN projects;
- Revisiting of the TASN Standard Operating Principles; and
- Discussions around laws concerning special education.

In FFY 2018, topics discussed in detail at the TASN Quarterly Meetings included:

- Updates and information from KSDE on the five Kansas State Board of Education outcomes, the School Redesign project, and other new and ongoing initiatives;
- An overview of Inspired Leadership practices;
- Equity considerations in education, including equity considerations within coaching conversations;
- A discussion highlighting Kansas' revised Social, Emotional, and Character Development Standards;
- Assistive and other technology used by the Kansas Infinitec project;
- Protocols for determining appropriate use of alternative assessments, including using the least dangerous assumption principle;
- The Kansas Family Engagement Framework; and

- Examining bias and rethinking special education.

Each meeting was intentionally designed to facilitate collaboration and increased shared understanding of each TASN project, KSDE priorities, and alignment with the Kansas MTSS and Alignment framework. Beginning in FFY 2017, additional meetings for TASN Project Directors were established in order to further understanding and collaboration among projects.

The TASN Quarterly Meeting evaluation data revealed that participants found the meetings to be relevant, useful, and of high quality. Following each meeting, participants were asked to rate items on a survey using a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Meeting participants provided an average rating of 4.48 for the item *I understand how the content/practice is intended to improve outcomes for children and youth*; 4.34 for the item *I will use the content or implement the practice(s) from this training*; and 4.40 for the item *Overall, the training was of high quality*.

Additionally, a member of the TASN Evaluation project rated each Quarterly Meeting using the *Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development* (Noonan, Gaumer Erickson, Brussow, & Langham, 2015). Evaluation project ratings noted that, on average, the events met 17 out of the 22 indicators of high-quality professional development. These ratings included 100% of the indicators in the Demonstration domain, 100% in the Engagement domain, and 87% in the Introduction domain.

Outcome 1b. KSDE staff and TASN providers collaborate to implement the Kansas MTSS and Alignment framework. A document review was conducted to evaluate the collaborative efforts and determine increased alignment of the KSDE infrastructures that facilitated the implementation of the Kansas MTSS and Alignment framework. A review and analysis consisting of 139 documents indicated high levels of message alignment across the KSDE divisions, among TASN providers, and across stakeholder groups. The collective message was instrumental in implementing an aligned system that supports districts in the implementation of a tiered framework of supports and interventions that improves reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional achievement of students, specifically students with disabilities, from early childhood through graduation.

The Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) Model. During FFY 2015, the KSDE launched KESA, a new state system of accreditation. This accreditation model features a district-level self-assessment in the areas of Relationships, Relevance, Responsive Culture, and Rigor. The self-assessment is followed by improvement plan development, implementation, and evaluation. During FFY 2016, district administrators were trained in this model and began the accreditation process. FFY 2017 was the first year Kansas schools could choose to complete accreditation within a five-year cycle based on readiness. Of the two public school districts that opted to be accredited in the first year, one was also a SIMR cohort district. While 67% of Kansas school districts opted to wait until the final year of the accreditation cycle (2022), 100% of the SIMR cohort districts chose to be accredited earlier than required, demonstrating increased readiness in the areas of Relationships, Relevance, Responsive Culture, and Rigor.

Kansas public school districts completed a needs assessment in FFY 2017 and provided self-assigned ratings for each of the four KESA components. Results showed that SIMR cohort districts rated their practices at one of the two highest levels (i.e., transitioning or modeling) at a much higher frequency than other Kansas school districts (Table 5).

Table 5

Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) District Self-Ratings.

KESA Component	Percentage of SIMR cohort districts <i>Transitioning or Modeling</i>	Percentage of all districts <i>Transitioning or Modeling</i>
Relationships	60%	26%
Relevance	60%	37%
Responsive Culture	60%	36%
Rigor	60%	31%

KESA requires districts to have a tiered framework of supports and interventions. The KSDE Accreditation Advisory Council was instrumental in the development of the KESA and implementation timeline. As members of the advisory council, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers collaborated with the KSDE on the key components of a tiered framework within KESA. Additionally, the KPIRC Director collaborated with Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers and KSDE staff to determine the key components of family engagement that are necessary for full implementation of a tiered framework within the accreditation process. During FFY 2018, districts continued to work directly with KSDE staff and TASN providers to implement improvement plans in the areas of Relationships, Relevance, Responsive Culture, and Rigor. Each district has an Outside Visitation Team to guide and evaluate accreditation efforts. During FFY 2017, Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers served on the Outside Visitation Teams for 26 districts.

During FFY 2015, the KSDE Accreditation Advisory Council met six times to inform and finalize the KESA process. During FFY 2016, the Accreditation Advisory Council met five times to provide input into the accreditation process, Outside Visitation Team procedures, implementation of family engagement practices aligned with KESA indicators, state assessment and pilot options, teacher licensure, and the training process and materials for districts. During FFY 2017, the Accreditation Advisory Council met five times to implement and inform the KESA process, including K-12 accreditation; teacher licensure; and consistency in training, resources, structures, and evaluation. During FFY 2018, the Accreditation Advisory Council met five times, determining additional training and technical assistance needed for Outside Visitation Team members, providing feedback into the Accreditation Review Council handbook, and discussing alignment between KESA rubrics and the Kansas State Board of Education vision. The 56 stakeholders on the council included representatives of the KSDE divisions, school districts, parents, private and special purpose schools, postsecondary education, business and industry, KPIRC, and members of the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Consolidated State Plan and School Improvement Supports. Kansas MTSS and Alignment, as well as the State Systemic

Improvement Plan, are integral to the ESEA Consolidated Plan. As identified in the Kansas ESEA Consolidated Plan:

The KSDE provides support to districts through Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) and Alignment training, a coherent continuum of evidence based, system-wide practices to support a rapid response to academic and behavioral needs, with frequent data-based monitoring for instructional decision making. Through Kansas MTSS and Alignment, the Kansas IDEA State Performance Plan, State Systemic Improvement Plan, Indicator 17 coherent improvement strategy results in a realigned, reallocated, collaborative professional learning infrastructure, which increases the capacity of districts to implement evidence-based instruction and interventions for each student. The IDEA SSIP short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes, informed by stakeholder involvement, directly align with the Kansas ESEA state plan. District adoption of Kansas MTSS and Alignment includes a proactive approach to improving academic performance, positive behavioral supports and interventions that promote student health and safety, improved social and emotional competency, and decreased removals from the classroom (2018, p. 61).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act school improvement supports provided the rationale for the Kansas Learning Network to become a TASN project. During FFY 2015, instructional coaches were hired and underwent an extensive training process to expand skills in coaching schools eligible for school improvement, which closely aligns with the KESA accreditation model. In FFY 2016, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018, Kansas Learning Network instructional coaches provided continual, intensive coaching and support to eligible districts. This work included a comprehensive needs assessment, root-cause analysis, implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs, and fostering collective leadership skills within district- and building-level leadership teams. Kansas Learning Network instructional coaches and Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers collaborated extensively to coach districts eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement. During FFY 2016, the ESEA Advisory Council met four times, providing guidance on the ESEA Consolidated Plan and alignment with the Kansas State Board of Education vision and outcomes, KESA, Kansas Learning Network support process, Comprehensive Support and Improvement timeline and procedures, and early learning. During FFY 2017, the ESEA Advisory Council met five times, providing guidance on implementation of the ESEA Consolidated Plan, KESA, TASN, and the Kansas Learning Network support process. During FFY 2018, the ESEA Advisory Council met twice, and continued discussions via virtual collaboration between meetings. The Council member provided input into the process for identification and technical assistance plan for Targeted Support and Improvement, Comprehensive Support and Improvement, and Additional Targeted Support; reviewed paraprofessional requirements; and expanded their knowledge of the KSDE Technical Assistance System Network (TASN), including providers working extensively with schools eligible for support (i.e., Kansas Learning Network and Kansas Parent Information Resource Center). The 40 stakeholders on the council included representatives of the KSDE divisions, school districts, the KPIRC, the Kansas PTI, the Kansas PTA, and postsecondary education.

Kansas MTSS and Alignment Staff. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project collaborated extensively to expand practices in family engagement, evidenced-based social and

emotional interventions and schoolwide practices, trauma-informed practices, and school mental health interventions. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers met as a group monthly, participated in all TASN Quarterly Meetings, served on KSDE advisory committees, and received guidance from the State Board of Education and Special Education Advisory Council. The stakeholder collaboration resulted in the development and implementation of the MTSS *Family Engagement Survey* (Noonan, Gaumer Erickson, & Groff, 2015) and the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson, Monroe, and Noonan, 2017), which schools implementing Kansas MTSS and Alignment, including the SSIP SIMR cohort districts, utilized. Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, found in Outcome 2g, reports the results of this collaboration. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers also collaborated extensively with the Kansas SPDG to integrate school mental health practices within the Kansas MTSS and Alignment framework.

Medium-Term Outcomes: Installation of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices

Outcome 1c. KSDE and TASN Leadership Create the Conditions That Facilitate Implementation. The TASN was intentionally designed to provide a statewide structure that supports districts in the implementation of evidence-based practices, including Kansas MTSS and Alignment. A Request for Application process that outlined standard operating principles, a streamlined coordination process, and an evaluation plan enhanced the TASN in FFY 2014. These TASN structures were enacted in FFY 2015 and sustained in FFY 2016, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018, resulting in a coherent system of technical assistance designed to enhance the capacity of schools to implement evidence-based practices that result in improved achievement and outcomes for Kansas students. The Request for Application for the next five-year TASN cycle was released in FFY 2018 to allow time for a detailed review and contract negotiation process in FFY 2019 and seamless transitioning to TASN 3.0 in FFY 2020.

The TASN structures were analyzed, direct feedback was collected from stakeholders, and the overall TASN system was evaluated to determine if the conditions created by KSDE and TASN leadership to facilitate the implementation of evidence-based practices were effective. The TASN structures that facilitate implementation include: (a) overarching TASN operating principles for all projects; (b) the KSDE TASN website, which provides a common location for all TASN resources, training registrations, materials, and evaluation; (c) alignment across projects through coordination and evaluation, and (d) data from the required TASN Quarterly and midyear meetings that all TASN providers attend. Additionally, during FFY 2017, each TASN project participated in a 3 plus 2 review, garnering feedback from a national stakeholder group on strengths and areas of growth for the overall system and each TASN project. This national stakeholder group included representative from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs, the NCSI, the Center for Parent Information and Resources, Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports, the Kansas State Board of Education, and Kansas school districts. As evidenced in monthly TASN Leadership Team minutes, recommendations were utilized by the TASN Leadership Team to continue to enhance and refine the TASN structures, specifically expanding family engagement and early childhood professional development, enhancing evaluation of implementation and outcomes, and identifying unmet needs and alignment opportunities across the state.

An annual survey asked all TASN providers for input on the effectiveness of leadership, coordination, and evaluation of the TASN system. The survey included Likert-type and open-ended response items. When asked how well the TASN Coordination project performed various duties, a majority of TASN providers responded *Working well* or *Working very well* to each survey item. See Table 6 for a selection of survey results.

Table 6
FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Coordination Project: Effectiveness Survey.

Survey Items	Percentage of TASN providers who responded <i>Working well</i> or <i>Working very well</i>			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Support you in implementing your project’s scope of work	87.8%	91.9%	90.0%	93.6%
Help you understand how your project aligns with the MTSS framework	70.7%	75.0%	83.8%	82.2%
Further your understanding of other TASN projects	68.3%	76.3%	82.5%	82.6%
Keep you up-to-date on KSDE priorities and legislative mandates	69.5%	81.6%	90.0%	85.1%
Collaborate with you to address challenges	76.9%	78.4%	80.0%	87.0%

When asked how well the TASN Evaluation project performed various duties, a majority of TASN providers responded *Working well* or *Working very well* to each survey item. See Table 7 for a selection of survey results.

Table 7
FFY 2015 – FFY 2018 Evaluation Project: Effectiveness Survey.

Survey Items	Percentage of TASN providers who responded <i>Working well</i> or <i>Working very well</i>			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Support your project to make data-informed decisions	87.5%	85.3%	87.5%	95.7%
Provide evaluation data in a timely manner	92.3%	88.6%	95.0%	95.7%
Provide evaluation data in an easily interpretable manner	92.5%	88.6%	100.0%	95.7%
Collaborate with your project to address challenges	87.5%	83.3%	87.8%	95.7%

Each year, results of the feedback survey are reviewed at the Monthly TASN Leadership Team meetings, with refinements made based on these data. These refinements have included increasing the collaboration among project directors to expand participants’ understanding of other TASN projects and alignment to the Kansas Integrated Accountability System, the ESEA Consolidated Plan, and the Kansas State Board of Education vision. Additionally, an annual evaluation brief was developed for each TASN project as a method to develop a shared understanding of the TASN projects’ implementation and medium-term outcomes. Evaluation briefs for FFY 2015, FFY 2016, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018 are available at <https://ksdetasn.org/evaluation/tasn-provider-evaluation-briefs>.

In addition to the evaluation of each TASN project, the TASN system was evaluated to ensure that conditions were created to facilitate implementation across the state. During FFY 2016, 408 professional learning events were posted through the TASN website. During FFY 2017, 420 professional learning events were posted through the TASN website. During FFY 2018, 428 professional learning events were posted through the TASN website. Participants rated aspects of these events on a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Results from these ratings are outlined in Table 8:

Table 8
Survey Determining the Effectiveness of TASN Professional Learning Events.

Survey Items	Average Ratings (scale 1-5)		
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
I understand how the content/practice is intended to improve outcomes for children and youth.	4.34	4.37	4.35
I will use the content or implement the practice(s) from this training.	4.25	4.27	4.31
Overall, the training was of high quality.	4.25	4.30	4.31

Additionally, using the *Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development* (Noonan et al., 2015), the TASN Evaluation project observed and evaluated 45 trainings in FFY 2015, 68 trainings in FFY 2016, 73 trainings in FFY 2017, and 73 trainings in FFY 2018. Results from the six domains on this checklist revealed that the majority of trainings each year met the criteria for high quality within each domain, as demonstrated in Table 9. Following each observation, the observer from the TASN Evaluation project delivered a coaching email to the TASN provider with the option of additional evaluation coaching meetings.

Table 9
Annual Observation Checklist for High Quality Professional Development (Noonan et al., 2015) Results by Domain.

Domains	Percentage of TASN events meeting the criteria for high quality within each domain			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Preparation	80.0%	91.2%	97.3%	97.3%
Introduction	93.3%	92.6%	94.5%	95.9%
Demonstration	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.3%
Engagement	91.1%	95.6%	97.3%	94.5%
Evaluation/Reflection	91.1%	85.3%	89.0%	87.7%
Mastery	75.6%	72.1%	83.6%	82.2%

Stakeholder Involvement in the SSIP Evaluation

Outcome 1d. The KSDE and TASN Make Data-Based Decisions and Share Data Through Communication Feedback Loops. Communication loops have been put in place to facilitate meaningful collaboration with stakeholders to assist in making data-based decisions. Communication modes include weekly KSDE Special Education and Title Services team meetings, monthly SPP/APR Committee meetings and TASN Leadership Team meetings, bimonthly KSDE workgroup and stakeholder meetings, TASN Quarterly Meetings, TASN midyear meetings, and annual conferences. Meeting minutes indicated that data-based decision making was a consistent component across committees and workgroups. Utilization-focused evaluation structures have been put in place in each TASN project, and with the support of the TASN Evaluation project, data are consistently collected, analyzed, and interpreted. The utilization-focused evaluation results are then used to inform decisions across all levels of the system.

In FFY 2018, KSDE leadership conducted 12 midyear meetings with TASN projects. The TASN Coordination project facilitated each meeting, which included the director of the TASN Evaluation project and KSDE Special Education and Title Services leadership. Each of the TASN projects used implementation and outcome data to inform decisions about maintaining or adjusting scope, sequence, coaching strategies, and staffing. As observed by the TASN Evaluation lead, each meeting included data-based discussions that resulted in confirmation of the professional learning approach or adjustments to the project's implementation process.

The KSDE shared data and utilized stakeholder input through communication loops. This included disseminating information and facilitating feedback from:

- KSDE staff through cross-department workgroup meetings and weekly division meetings;
- State-level stakeholder groups through the Special Education Advisory Council, the ESEA Advisory Council, and the Accreditation Advisory Council
- All TASN projects through the mandatory TASN Quarterly Meetings; and
- Districts through monthly webinars, conferences, training events, listserv emails, and the KSDE and TASN websites.

The Kansas TASN Evaluation Brief (available at <https://ksdetasn.org/evaluation/tasn-provider-evaluation-briefs>), designed to inform stakeholders of the depth and breadth of TASN implementation, provides a snapshot of the TASN evaluation for FFY 2018.

Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making. Stakeholders informed SSIP implementation and evaluation decisions by providing input and feedback and by participating in decision-making groups following the principles of *Leading by Convening* (Cashman et al., 2014). Data were shared and discussed with stakeholders in a variety of ways, including at stakeholder meetings, through evaluation briefs, and through workgroups. As evidenced by meeting attendance and minutes, stakeholders were involved in the development and enactment of the KESA, informed TASN system improvements, and were included in decisions concerning the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Analysis of the FFY 2016 meeting agendas and minutes showed that the Special Education Advisory Council stakeholders provided

feedback to the KSDE regarding infrastructure, implementation, and outcomes of the SSIP, Kansas MTSS and Alignment, the Kansas SPDG, TASN, and early learning infrastructure. Analysis of the FFY 2017 meeting agendas and minutes showed that the Special Education Advisory Council stakeholders provided input and feedback to the KSDE regarding TASN evaluation, Kansas State Board of Education goals, emergency safety interventions, the Kansas SPDG, the ESEA Consolidated Plan, and the SPP/APR. The feedback was used to inform continual improvement efforts. Related to the SSIP, the Kansas State Board of Education provided feedback to the KSDE regarding KESA progress, social-emotional learning priorities in schools, the role of the School Mental Health Advisory Council, and the definition of a successful high school graduate.

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project utilized stakeholder feedback to inform data-based decisions as evidenced by observations of the midyear and TASN Leadership Team meetings. The decisions included (a) keeping the application process for districts open year-round and customizing the training based on districts' needs as determined by data, (b) addition of staff focused on psychometric properties of assessments and early childhood special education, (c) inclusion of tiered social and emotional supports, and (d) utility of data for local-level decision making. The following list provides detailed information about these decisions:

- a. Previously, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project accepted applications from districts during a short timeframe each year. Through feedback from the required district-level needs assessments, district leadership indicated that flexibility in the submission timeline would enable districts to complete a comprehensive needs assessment and access professional learning. Through enactment of this decision since FFY 2016, districts entered the professional learning process through a customized timeline determined through collaboration between the Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers and the district leadership team. Instead of a standardized training process, Kansas MTSS and Alignment customized the professional learning process for each district to meet district needs based on needs assessment and implementation data.
- b. As a districtwide initiative, Kansas MTSS and Alignment facilitates professional learning for early childhood through secondary educators. Universal screening in reading, math, and behavior is completed three times per year to monitor growth and determine the intervention needs of students, specifically students with disabilities. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project hired an additional staff member with expertise in psychometrics to better support districts in determining the research base of measures and accurately interpreting data for decision making. To better meet the needs of early childhood educators, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project has gone from one staff members with expertise in early childhood special education during FFY 2016 to a team of four during FFY 2018.
- c. The collaborative efforts of the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project also expanded to address the reading, math, behavior, and social and emotional needs of each student comprehensively. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project incorporated trauma-informed and resiliency practices into professional learning, capitalizing on

the expertise of existing State Trainers and the Kansas SPDG School Mental Health Initiative.

- d. In addition to collaboration across divisions within the KSDE, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project collaborated extensively with stakeholders to expand evidenced-based practices related to family engagement and social and emotional interventions practices. To ensure that evaluation measures provided actionable data for district implementation teams, the TASN Evaluation project conducted focus groups with 11 administrators during FFY 2016. Based on themes from these focus groups, the *School Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson, Noonan, & Jenson, 2012) was expanded into the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017) following extensive revisions during FFY 2017, and one item on the *Family Engagement Survey* (Noonan et al., 2015) was revised. During FFY 2018, an external evaluation of MTSS processes was conducted in one SIMR cohort district. The results showed that expertise within collaborative teams resulted in strong data-based decision making processes for interventions and the engagement of all students within the core curriculum.

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project leadership shared data with the KSDE through the formal structures of midyear and TASN Leadership Team meetings as well as actively participating on KSDE advisory councils and workgroups. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project also shared data with other TASN projects through the TASN Quarterly Meetings and ongoing collaborative efforts and with district leadership through the series of in-district trainings and coaching visits. The TASN Evaluation project verified data-based decision making and data sharing through document analyses and observations at meetings and trainings. To facilitate the communication of data, the TASN Evaluation project developed a Kansas MTSS and Alignment Evaluation Brief (available at <https://ksdetasn.org/evaluation/tasn-provider-evaluation-briefs>), which was disseminated to KSDE staff and other stakeholder groups.

Stakeholder involvement informed training, coaching, and technical assistance for all implementation drivers and all stages of implementation. Stakeholders included district personnel, community and family members, and state-level stakeholder groups.

Implementation and Outcomes of Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0: Evidence-Based Practices

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project supported districts in implementing evidence-based practices. The practices included provision of evidence-based core and intervention curricula, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement.

Short-Term Outcomes: Knowledge, Skills, and Collaboration

Outcome 2a. LEA educators demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment. During FFY 2018, data from multiple evaluation measures demonstrated that educators have the knowledge and skills necessary to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment. District and building leadership teams participated in five to six full days of ongoing training to develop the necessary structures to implement Kansas MTSS and

Alignment. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers provided both onsite and virtual coaching following the coaching practices outlined in the NCSI's *Effective Coaching of Teachers: Fidelity Tool Rubric* (Pierce, 2014), including adherence to essential ingredients, quality, dose, and participant responsiveness. As a measure of knowledge and skill development, a TASN evaluator observed 18 of the 102 Kansas MTSS and Alignment trainings. The evaluation of the training data revealed that each of the trainings met all or most of the indicators related to knowledge and skill development according to the *Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development* (Noonan et al., 2015). The indicators are:

- *Builds shared vocabulary required to implement and sustain the practice* (100% of trainings),
- *Includes opportunities for participants to apply content and/or practice skills during training* (94.4% of trainings),
- *Includes opportunities for participants to reflect on learning* (100% of trainings), and
- *Details follow-up activities that require participants to apply their learning* (94.4% of trainings).

Outcome 2b. LEA educators collaborate to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment.

The demonstration of educator collaboration was analyzed using evaluation data collected from ongoing training evaluations and a districtwide instructional staff survey. Kansas SIMR cohort districts completed the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017), an evaluation measure of personal implementation and stakeholder feedback of Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs. Results from 380 instructional staff in SIMR cohort districts showed that most agreed or strongly agreed with these statements regarding their Collaborative Teams:

- *Team members follow established team norms (e.g., speak directly, ask questions, express support, restate ideas)* (89.8%), an increase from 86.6% for the same item in FFY 2017 and from 84.9% in FFY 2016 for the item *Team members communicate effectively (e.g., speak directly, ask questions, express support, restate ideas)* and
- *Meetings are productive and focused on student progress* (84.3%), an increase from 81.5% in FFY 2017 and 80.1% in FFY 2016.

Results from six administrators in the SIMR cohort districts showed that the majority agreed or strongly agreed with statements regarding Building Leadership Teams:

- *Team members follow established team norms (e.g., speak directly, ask questions, express support, restate ideas)* (83.3%);
- *Meetings are productive and focused on implementation fidelity and progress* (83.3%);
- *My building leadership team is responsive to the needs and concerns of collaborative teacher teams* (100%);
- *Building leadership team decisions are communicated to collaborative teacher teams* (100%); and
- *The district leadership team is responsive to the needs and concerns of building leadership teams* (100%).

Additionally, a TASN evaluator observed and evaluated 18 of the 102 Kansas MTSS and Alignment trainings. Of the 18 trainings, all (100%) met the following indicator of high-quality professional development related to collaboration: *Facilitates opportunities for participants to*

interact with each other related to training content. Throughout the professional development process, *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* were triangulated with MTSS State Trainer observations reported on the *Checklist for Implementation Readiness* (Kansas MTSS and Alignment Project, 2016).

Medium-Term Outcomes: Installation of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices.

Medium-term outcomes addressed the installation of instructional practices, which included the provision of an evidence-based core curriculum and interventions, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement within Kansas MTSS and Alignment.

Outcome 2c. District and school administrators create the conditions that facilitate implementation. The implementation science drivers of Facilitative Administration and Adaptive/Technical Leadership were evaluated at both the structuring and implementation phases. Data collected from SIMR cohort districts through the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017) showed that schools had installed building leadership teams, collaborative teams, and districtwide assessment schedules. Twenty-four percent of instructional staff were members of building leadership teams; 64% of instructional staff were members of collaborative teams; and schools completed universal screeners for reading, math, and behavior three times each year.

Through the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017), instructional staff rated administrative support. Of the instructional staff in SIMR cohort districts that responded to the item *My administrators are committed to implementing tiered levels of reading supports*, 87.9% rated the statement as *Agree* or *Strongly Agree*, an increase from 87.0% in FFY 2016 but a decrease from 90.9% in FFY 2017.

Outcome 2d. District and school leadership teams and grade-level collaborative teams make data-based decisions and share data through communication loops. Through the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017), instructional staff rated involvement in the data-based decision-making process. These data were then verified through Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainer observations reported on the *Checklist for Implementation Readiness* (Kansas MTSS and Alignment Project, 2016). Of the 380 instructional staff in the SIMR cohort districts who responded to the survey, most rated the statements as a 4 (*Agree*) or 5 (*Strongly Agree*) on a 5-point Likert-type scale:

- *My collaborative team regularly shares in the responsibility of formal problem solving using data to make decisions* (84.0%), an increase from 80.5% in FFY 2017;
- *My building leadership team is responsive to the needs and concerns of collaborative teams* (78.4%), an increase from 77.5% in FFY 2017; and
- *Building leadership team decisions are communicated to collaborative teams* (79.2%), an increase from 75.7% in FFY 2017.

Additionally, for the portion of the survey dedicated to results from administrators, the SIMR cohort districts showed that most of the administrators indicated that the following structures have been implemented in their buildings:

- *My school has a process for regularly sharing data with staff* (83.3%);

- *My building leadership team regularly engages in formal problem solving using data to make decisions (66.7%);*
- *Students' reading, math, behavior, and social-emotional data are reviewed together to inform decisions (100%);*
- *My building leadership team is responsive to the needs and concerns of collaborative teacher teams (100%);*
- *Building leadership team decisions are communicated to collaborative teacher teams (100%);*
- *The district leadership team is responsive to the needs and concerns of building leadership teams (100%); and*
- *District leadership team decisions are communicated to my building leadership team (100%).*

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers facilitated district and building leadership teams in reflecting on the data, including *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017) results, and identifying system improvements based on the data. Throughout the professional development process, *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* results were triangulated with MTSS State Trainer observations that occurred through in-district coaching and were reported on the *Checklist for Implementation Readiness* (Kansas MTSS and Alignment Project, 2016).

Long-Term Outcomes of Implementation of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices With Fidelity

Outcome 2e. Evidence-based reading curriculum is implemented with fidelity. Of the instructional staff in the SIMR cohort districts that reported providing Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 reading instruction on the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017), most rated the following statements as a 4 (*Agree*) or 5 (*Strongly Agree*) on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Additional items were including in FFY 2017; data across years are described when available:

- *I have the technology and resources that I need to teach the core and/or intervention reading curricula with fidelity (71.8%), an increase from 59.0% in FFY 2016 and 69.2% in FFY 2017;*
- *The core reading curriculum is being implemented as it was intended (use of materials, sequencing, instructional strategies and routines, sufficient time for student practice) (78.1%), an increase from 73.2% in FFY 2017;*
- *Adequate, protected core instructional time is provided for reading (87.0%), an increase from 84.4% in FFY 2017;*
- *The data suggest that the core reading curriculum meets students' needs (61.5%), an increase from 57.3% in FFY 2016 and 60.6% in FFY 2017;*
- *When a student isn't making adequate progress in the core reading curriculum, instructional practices are adjusted (81.3%), an increase from 77.7% in FFY 2017;*

- *I review reading universal screening data for every student that I teach (81.3%), an increase from 67.1% in FFY 2016 and 72.5% in FFY 2017;*
- *Students that meet the benchmark on the reading universal screener receive adequate, appropriate instruction (86.4%), an increase from 80.4% in FFY 2017; and*
- *All students, including students with disabilities and English learners, are included in core reading instruction (91.1%), an increase from 88.9% in FFY 2017.*

Of the administrators in the SIMR cohort districts who responded to the survey, 83.3% indicated that, for reading, *adequate, protected core instructional time* has been implemented schoolwide. Additionally, 100% of administrators indicated that schoolwide administration of a research-based universal reading screener occurs at least three times per year. Most of the responding administrators in the SIMR cohort districts responded *Yes, implemented schoolwide* to the following items:

- *A research-based core curriculum that addresses the standards and essential elements of reading is taught (100%);*
- *All students, including students with disabilities and English learners, are included in core reading instruction (83.3%);*
- *Administration ensures that teachers are administering universal reading screeners correctly (100%)*
- *If less than 80% of students are at benchmark, we focus on improving instructional practices within the core reading curriculum (100%); and*
- *Administration ensures that training and coaching are provided to teachers to improve the fidelity of implementation (83.3%).*

District and building leadership teams, in collaboration with Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, analyzed district- and building-level *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017) data to improve implementation fidelity of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, leading to improved student outcomes. Data analyses included examining curricula, assessment, leadership, empowering culture, and instruction at all tiers, as well as determining the efficacy of building leadership teams and collaborative teams. Data analyses resulted in the implementation of district- and building-level action planning to continually enhance and refine the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Focus groups conducted with building principals in FFY 2016 identified the data from educators as critical for evaluating the fidelity of implementation through a self-correcting feedback loop. Specific actions related to implementation of evidence-based reading curricula included providing additional professional development on an evidence-based reading curriculum and instructional practices and developing a communication plan to share data with instructional staff on a regular basis.

Outcome 2f. Evidence-based interventions in reading are provided based on universal screening data and decision protocols. Of the 380 instructional staff in the SIMR cohort districts who responded to items on the *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017), most rated the following statements as a 4 (*Agree*) or 5 (*Strongly Agree*) on a 5-point Likert-type scale:

- *My school has a clear plan for supporting students that are nonresponsive to the Tier 1 support (75.5%), an increase from 74.4% in FFY 2017 and 66.7% in FFY 2016;*

- *I review reading progress monitoring data for every student that I teach who receives reading interventions (81.3%), an increase from 72.7% in FFY 2017 and 65.9% in FFY 2016;*
- *When screening data indicate need regarding a student's reading, the student is placed in appropriate interventions (83.1%), an increase from 82.6% in FFY 2017 and 63.5% in FFY 2016;*
- *Diagnostic assessment data are used to inform decisions about strategic and intensive reading interventions for individual students (84.4%), an increase from 83.0% in FFY 2017 and 62.0% in FFY 2016;*
- *Trained staff are providing reading interventions (82.9%), an increase from 72.2% when this item was first asked in FFY 2017;*
- *Reading interventions are being implemented as intended (use of materials, sequencing, pacing, instructional strategies and routines, sufficient time for student practice) (76.9%), an increase from 75.5% when this item was first asked in FFY 2017;*
- *The data suggest that the reading interventions meet students' needs (73.4%), an increase from 68.5% in FFY 2017 and 59.4% in FFY 2016;*
- *When progress monitoring data indicate need regarding a student's reading progress, the instructional practices in the interventions are adjusted (81.1%), an increase from 75.6% in FFY 2017 and 60.4% in FFY 2016;*
- *Decision guidelines are followed to move students among and between groups for reading interventions (83.3%), an increase from 78.8% when this item was first asked in FFY 2017; and*
- *Families are informed of their child's need for and placement into reading interventions (82.6%), an increase from 77.8% when this item was first asked in FFY 2017.*

The majority of the administrators in the SIMR cohort districts who completed the survey responded *Yes, implemented schoolwide* to the following items regarding interventions:

- *A standard protocol has been developed for identifying intensive, strategic, and benchmark and beyond support matched to student needs (80.0%);*
- *Decision guidelines determine the need, intensity, and duration of reading interventions (83.3%);*
- *Adequate instructional time is provided for reading interventions (100%);*
- *Trained staff provide reading interventions (83.3%);*
- *Administration ensures that teachers follow the reading intervention protocol (66.7%); and*
- *Families are informed of their child's need for and placement into reading interventions (60.0%).*

District and building leadership teams, in collaboration with Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, analyzed district- and building-level *Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale* (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017) data to improve implementation fidelity of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, leading to improved student outcomes. Data analyses included examining curricula, assessment, leadership, empowering culture, and instruction at all tiers along with determining the efficacy of building leadership teams and collaborative teams. Data analyses resulted in the implementation

of district- and building-level action planning to continually enhance and refine the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Focus groups conducted with building principals in FFY 2016 identified the data from educators as critical for evaluating the fidelity of implementation through a self-correcting feedback loop. Specific actions taken by SIMR cohort districts related to implementation of reading interventions included the development of standard protocols and a decision matrix of evidence-based interventions and decision rules to determine the need, intensity, and duration of interventions.

Outcome 2g. Families are engaged in the data-based decision making and the progress monitoring process for their children. The MTSS *Family Engagement Survey* (Noonan et al., 2015) was developed and deployed to gain feedback from family stakeholders. The survey is based on the National PTA Standards for Family-School Partnerships, and items are separated into the domains of Welcoming Environment, Supporting Student Learning, Effective Communication, Sharing Power and Advocacy, and Community Involvement. Results in Table 10 indicate that SIMR cohort families, including 2,787 responses in FFY 2015, 2,103 responses in FFY 2016, 2,405 responses in FFY 2017, and 2,578 responses in FFY 2018, increasingly agreed or strongly agreed with key indicators of family engagement throughout each year of the SIMR.

Table 10
Family Engagement Survey Results 2015-16 Through 2018-19 by Item.

Items	Percentage of respondents answering <i>Agree</i> or <i>Strongly Agree</i>			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
I'm provided understandable data on my child's progress.	77.9%	82.3%	83.8%	84.6%
School staff consult me before making important decisions about my child's education.	60.4%	67.6%	71.2%	75.4%
If my child receives additional supports, I am provided with information about these supports.	58.6%	65.7%	71.2%	73.4%
School staff keep me well informed about how my child is doing in school.	65.4%	73.4%	77.7%	79.4%
I have a good working relationship with school staff in which we solve problems together.	66.6%	74.3%	75.5%	80.2%

Additionally, averages for each *Family Engagement Survey* (Noonan et al., 2015) domain increased for SIMR cohort districts each year of implementation of the Kansas MTSS and Alignment framework (Table 11).

Table 11
Family Engagement Survey Results 2015-16 Through 2018-19 by Domain.

Domains	Domain Averages (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Welcoming Environment	3.93	4.12	4.13	4.21

Supporting Student Learning	3.82	3.99	4.05	4.10
Effective Communication	3.75	3.93	3.99	4.06
Sharing Power and Advocacy	3.76	3.95	3.99	4.08
Community Involvement	3.56	3.71	3.83	3.94
Overall	3.77	3.95	4.00	4.08

District and building leadership teams reviewed building- and district-level *Family Engagement Survey* (Noonan et al., 2015) data in order to identify strengths and target specific areas for improvement. Focus groups conducted with building principals in FFY 2016 identified the *Family Engagement Survey* (Noonan et al., 2015) data as critical for evaluating the fidelity of implementation through a self-correcting feedback loop. Specific actions related to family engagement included developing a process for regularly sharing data with all families and embedding family engagement into the implementation protocol for reading interventions.

The Impact on Student Outcomes. Impact addresses student-level outcomes resulting from the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment.

Outcome 2h. Students make progress in reading achievement. Data from the schools within SIMR cohort districts serving students K-5 indicated an increase in the percentage of students with disabilities at benchmark and a decrease in the percentage of students needing interventions (Table 12).

Table 12

Percentage of K-5 Students With Disabilities at Benchmark, Requiring Tier 2 Interventions, and Requiring Tier 3 Interventions in Reading.

	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Difference
At Benchmark	26.7%	31.1%	4.4%
Tier 2	26.3%	24.6%	-1.7%
Tier 3	46.9%	44.3%	-2.6%
	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Difference
At Benchmark	26.2%	30.3%	4.1%
Tier 2	26.9%	21.2%	-5.7%
Tier 3	46.9%	48.5%	1.6%

For students to reach grade-level benchmark on a CBM-GOM, students must achieve both 95% accuracy and fluency consistent with the grade-level criteria. When students struggle learning to read, intervention initially focuses on improvement in accuracy and then shifts to improvement in fluency, which allows the student to achieve benchmark. In FFY 2016, the percentage of students with disabilities in grades two through five who achieved the 95% accuracy criteria improved by 23.0%, from 42.2% in fall to 65.2% in spring. In FFY 2017, the percentage meeting the 95% accuracy criteria improved by 34.1%, from 37.7% in fall to 71.8% in spring. In FFY 2018, the percentage meeting the 95% accuracy criteria improved by 24.4%, from 39.1% in fall to 63.5% in spring. Developing interventions focused on students' needs resulted in individual

student growth, which is expected to continue to result in increased student achievement in the FFY 2019 SIMR data. In addition to gains in accuracy, 34.9% of students with disabilities served by SIMR cohort districts exceeded the expected grade-level growth for all students during FFY 2017, with some classrooms seeing over 60% of their students with disabilities making more than expected gains. Exceeding expected growth is an essential factor in allowing students who are not reaching grade-level benchmark to close the achievement gap. With the combined improvements in Kansas SIMR data and the more discreet student-level data, stakeholders determined the intervention to be effective.

Outcome 2i (SIMR). Increased percentage of students with disabilities in grades K-5 score at grade level in reading as measured by Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM). Kansas' SIMR results are derived from CBM-GOM impact measures. The FFY 2018 Indicator 17 data for students with disabilities kindergarten through fifth grade met the intended target.

Table 13
Kansas State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=		29.95%	30.00%	27.52%	28.50%	29.50%
Data	29.95%*	24.41%	26.37%	27.52%**	31.11%	30.25%

*Baseline

** Baseline Re-Established

Implementation and Outcomes of Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0: Evaluation.

The Kansas TASN Evaluation project, in collaboration with KSDE leadership, TASN providers, and stakeholder groups, designed and installed the multiyear Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan (Appendix C) that outlines short- and long-term objectives aligned to the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action (Appendix A) and Kansas SSIP Logic Model (Appendix B). The TASN Evaluation project monitors adherence to timelines, implementation, outcomes of infrastructure development, and support for district implementation of evidence-based practices.

The evaluation indicators align with the following five Kansas TASN evaluation outcome domains:

1. Participants increase awareness, knowledge, and skills;
2. Administrators and supervisors create conditions that support implementation;
3. Participants implement evidence-based practices with fidelity;
4. Students and children improve academic, behavioral, and social outcomes; and
5. Schools and organizations sustain implementation with fidelity.

The evaluation measures and timeline were carefully designed to support data-based decision making in the areas of infrastructure development, alignment, and the implementation of evidence-based practices. At both the state and local levels, improvements are facilitated through the use of a problem-solving approach referred to as the self-correcting feedback loop. By using the self-correcting feedback loop, school and district teams are provided timely data that helps guide them to make data-informed decisions at the student, grade, school, and district levels.

Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers function as district coaches and utilize the data to prioritize improvements in knowledge, skills, and implementation within districts. The KSDE TASN Leadership Team analyzes aggregate student, district, and project data to inform infrastructure development and systems improvements. KSDE leadership, in collaboration with stakeholder groups, utilizes evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation, measure progress toward achieving intended improvements, and make modifications to the Kansas SSIP as necessary. Utilizing the *NCSI SSIP Infrastructure Development and Progress Measurement Tool: Using Implementation Drivers & Stages of Implementation* (National Center for Systemic Improvement, 2018), the Kansas SSIP is in the initial implementation stage or full implementation stage within each implementation driver.

For FFY 2018, the overall focus of the Kansas SSIP continued without modifications. As a result of using the self-correcting feedback loop, data are continually utilized to determine infrastructure adjustments, training, technical assistance, and coaching necessary to support districts' implementation and refinement of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Analyses of the progress data identified sufficient progress was made in the implementation of coherent improvement strategies that support the achievement of the SIMR. Analyses were guided by implementation science research and the final determination was that modifications to the improvement strategies or timeline are not needed at this time. Students with disabilities in kindergarten through fifth grade are demonstrating growth in reading achievement. Data demonstrating student-level improvement justified the decision to maintain the current improvement strategies and targets of the Kansas SSIP.

Stakeholder Involvement in the SSIP Evaluation. Stakeholders informed SSIP evaluation decisions by providing input and feedback and by participating in decision-making groups. Stakeholders, from families to state-level groups, are kept informed and provide input at all levels and stages of SSIP implementation. Detailed stakeholder engagement results are located in outcomes sections 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2b, 2c, and 2g. Stakeholder feedback, which consisted of both quantitative and qualitative methods, was utilized to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the Kansas SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the Kansas SIMR. Results of a formative, utilization-focused evaluation with stakeholder input, aligned with implementation science and guided by data-based implementation, indicate that the Kansas SSIP is on track to continue to impact student achievement, resulting in measurable improvement in the Kansas SIMR.

The TASN Evaluation project facilitated input from stakeholder groups, including the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, KSDE and TASN providers, district and school leadership, school instructional staff, and families. The TASN Evaluation project encouraged these stakeholder groups to ask clarifying questions in order to determine ease of interpretation, the accuracy of the graphical displays, and the usefulness of the data. In FFY 2016, an outside evaluator reviewed the logic model and evaluation plan to determine the degree to which these documents followed the theory of change, included valid data-collection procedures, and, potentially, would result in the desired outcomes. Results from the outside evaluator indicated that the logic was precise from short-term to long-term outcomes and that the measures adequately substantiated the evaluation indicators and theory of change. In FFY 2015 and FFY 2017, focus groups/interviews were conducted with administrators regarding the utility of the

Family Engagement Survey results. Themes showed that the data resulted in the improvement of family engagement practices which positively impacted the rating of engagement from parents/guardians. In FFY 2018, an outside evaluator conducted a process evaluation within one SIMR cohort district, enacting quantitative and qualitative methods to determine the MTSS structures and processes that positively impacted the reading outcomes for students with disabilities. Results revealed that the teaming and data-based decision making structures, core instruction student engagement practices, and systematized intervention protocols positively impacted the achievement of students with disabilities.

D. Data Quality Issues

Overview

The quality of the evaluation data was examined for limitations that could affect progress reports or the implementation of the SSIP in achieving the SIMR. To ensure that quality of the evaluation was not affected, policies and procedures of the Kansas Data Quality Assurances were closely monitored. The KSDE Data Quality Assurance policies include training and data certification of district staff. Furthermore, the TASN Evaluation project provided additional data verification. The IDEA Data Center guidance on data collection, analysis, and reporting was reviewed to confirm that Kansas Indicator 17 data are timely, accurate, and complete. Self-correcting feedback loops have been constructed within the context of the evaluation to ensure that data support decision making for schools, districts, TASN providers, and the KSDE. The KSDE has not identified concerns related to the quality or quantity of data used for reporting SSIP implementation or results.

Data Quality Addressed Through Meta-Evaluation

A meta-evaluation was conducted to ensure the evaluation met the *Joint Committee Standards for Educational Evaluation* (2010). These standards relate to the utility, accountability, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy of the evaluation. In addition to the evaluation audit and process evaluation conducted by external evaluators, in each year (i.e., FFY 2015, FFY 2016, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018), all TASN providers were asked to provide input on the effectiveness of the TASN system evaluation by completing a survey including both Likert and open-ended response items. When asked how well the TASN Evaluation project performed various duties, a majority of TASN providers responded *Working well* or *Working very well* to each survey item. Specifically, more than 95% of TASN providers selected one of these two responses for the items: *Support your project to make data-informed decisions*, *Provide evaluation data in a timely manner*, *Provide evaluation data in an easily interpretable manner*, and *Collaborate with your project to address challenges*. The results of the feedback survey were reviewed at least annually at TASN Leadership Team meetings, and specific improvements (e.g., scheduling of additional meetings with TASN projects to interpret data and address challenges) were made based on these data. (See Section C: Outcome 1c for annual comparisons).

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

The KSDE made progress toward achieving the intended improvements. State infrastructure progress, described in Section C: Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0, demonstrates increased alignment of priorities to the Kansas State Board of Education vision and outcomes, including the KESA, Kansas Learning Network School Improvement System, and the TASN. Through

high levels of collaboration and continuous data-based feedback, the KSDE has enacted improvements that enable districts to implement evidence-based practices.

As described in Section C: Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, school districts, including the SIMR cohort through utilization of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, have expanded implementation of evidence-based practices. The implementation of evidence-based practices ensures that each student, specifically each student with a disability, receives the instruction and interventions necessary to improve reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional achievement. These practices included provisions of an evidence-based core curriculum and interventions, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement. During FFY 2018, SIMR cohort districts implemented Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs with fidelity, collected and analyzed implementation fidelity data, and enacted data-based decisions through self-correcting feedback loops. Data demonstrate that the SIMR Cohort districts are making improvements in implementation of evidence-based practices, resulting in the desired effects of improved reading proficiency for students with disabilities in kindergarten through 5th grade.

As described in Section C: Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0, the evaluation of the SSIP is comprehensive, utilization-focused, and designed to support decision making at the classroom, school, district, provider, and state levels. The meta-evaluation confirmed the evaluation measures, processes, and analyses meet the needs of the decision makers at these levels and follow the theory of change and logic model through aligned short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes leading to the SIMR.

F. Plans for Next Year

Activities and Timeline

During FFY 2019, the Kansas SSIP will continue to be implemented as detailed in the Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy Activity Timeline and Status (Appendix D). The SSIP evaluation activities, along with the timelines, are in the Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan (Appendix C).

Barriers and Supports

The most common barrier consistently identified was implementation overload. Within the last five years, a variety of new initiatives have been implemented in the Kansas educational environment, including the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a new Kansas State Board of Education vision and outcomes, a new accreditation system (KESA), the KSDE Kansans Can School Redesign project, and continually refined Kansas MTSS and Alignment recommendations. To address the overload barrier, additional attention has been given to improving alignment and communication, and decreasing duplication of local efforts. An emerging role of the KSDE TASN is to provide readiness and sustainability for the KSDE Kansans Can School Redesign project, in addition to ensuring students with disabilities are receiving a high-quality education with specially designed instruction. The KSDE intentionally selects strong, evidence-based practices; embeds these practices within all initiatives; and works to align tools, forms, and reports. These efforts have been, and will continue to be, carried out through the scope of work within Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0

of the Kansas SSIP. Schools will continue to enhance their implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment evidence-based practices focused on improving reading achievement for each student, including each student with a disability. No significant barriers to full implementation were evident, but implementation will continue to be monitored on a continuous basis through evaluation and coaching using the self-correcting feedback loop.

Support and Technical Assistance for the SEA

To continue the sustained implementation of the Kansas SSIP, the KSDE will continue to access an array of in-state providers and national partners to support the KSDE and Kansas school districts. The KSDE will remain informed and engaged through utilizing the resources offered by the national technical assistance centers and matching those resources to the state's identified needs. The KSDE will continue to access existing customized technical assistance as determined by the KSDE, including support initiated by Kansas with the NCSI, IDEA Data Center, and the SPDG Network. Through the SSIP infrastructure development, the state will increase the capacity to support the implementation of evidence-based practices, including increasing the capacity of technical assistance providers. In addition, there will be continued collaboration and support from all teams within the agency and dialog with stakeholders that will provide opportunities for feedback to improve program alignment. Through the culmination of these efforts, the KSDE will continue to increase capacity and scale-up efforts that support Kansas school districts as schools strive to continually improve reading achievement for students with disabilities.

References


- 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.
- Gaumer Erickson, A.S., Monroe, K., & Noonan, P.M. (2017). *Inclusive MTSS implementation scale*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Center for Research on Learning.
- Gaumer Erickson, A.S., Noonan, P.M., & Jenson, R. (2012). The school implementation scale: Measuring implementation in response to intervention models. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 10(2), 33-52.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2010). *The program evaluation standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.jcsee.org/program-evaluation-standards>
- Kansas MTSS and Alignment Project. (2016). *Checklist for implementation readiness*. Topeka, KS: Kansas State Department of Education.
- National Center for Systemic Improvement (2018). *SSIP infrastructure development and progress measurement tool: Using implementation drivers & stages of implementation*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Noonan, P.M., Gaumer Erickson, A.S., Brussow, J., & Langham, A. (2015). *Observation checklist for high-quality professional development* [Updated]. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Center for Research on Learning.
- Noonan, P. M., Gaumer Erickson, A.S., Groff, J. (2015). *Family engagement survey*. Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN). Adapted from *Family Engagement: A critical component to building an empowering culture in Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS)*. Topeka, KS: TASN. Available from <http://ksdetasn.org/resources/403>.
- Pierce, J. D. (2014). *Effective Coaching of Teachers: Fidelity Tool Rubric*. National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). Washington, D.C.: NCSI. Available from <https://ncsi-library.wested.org/resources/59>.

Appendix A

Kansas SSIP Theory of Action

1. KSDE has...		2. KSDE ...	3. Then ...	4. Then...	5. Then...
		<i>Conclusions from SSIP Analysis Activities</i>	<i>Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0</i>	<i>Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0</i>	<i>Intermediate Outcome - SIMR is Achieved</i>
GOVERNANCE & QUALITY STANDARDS	a Board of Education who has established Mission and Goals providing direction for all KSDE initiatives.	has effective and aligned leadership to provide direction for priorities and actions.	KSDE will align state level policies, organization and infrastructure to efficiently and effectively allocate resources and supports to increase state and district capacity to support sustained implementation of evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to perform at grade level.	through the district level implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, the capacity of districts will be increased to effectively implement evidence-based practices in a sustainable way linked to achieving improved reading outcomes for students with disabilities.	the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR), will increase the percentage of students with disabilities Grades K-5 who score at grade level end of year benchmark on a reading general outcome measure.
	a single Special Education and Title Services team.				
ACCOUNTABILITY & MONITORING	an ESEA Flexibility Waiver and submits reports regarding progress of Title I schools.	has an initial alignment of accountability processes and needs to focus on refining program and policy implementation alignment.			
	a process to annually submit the progress of students with disabilities in the KS SPP/APR including reading progress of students with disabilities in district cohorts.				
	a system of general supervision called Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS) that includes monitoring, dispute resolution, compliance and fiscal at state and local level.				
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING	a commitment to provide multiple conferences annually and a variety of training cadres to support statewide need.	has a coordinated system to support technical assistance and professional learning but needs to scale up sustainable capacity to support implementation of evidence-based reading instructional practices.	KS TASN, specifically technical assistance and professional learning, will be coordinated, leveraged to reduce duplication, use evaluation results to inform decisions, and increase progress monitoring of student performance, and provide evidence-base resources for dissemination.		
	a system to support Title I Focus and Priority Schools through the Kansas Learning Network.				
	a commitment to refining a sustainable statewide MTSS supporting the academics and behavior and social needs for all students.	needs to leverage technical assistance and professional learning across accountability systems for building local capacity to implement & sustain evidence-based practices.			
	a commitment to funding the Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) that provides professional learning and technical assistance to schools and families in identified areas to improve outcomes for all students.				
Revised 04-01-2015					

Appendix B
Kansas SSIP Logic Model



Appendix C
Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan

Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan		
Outcomes	Indicators	Measures
Short-Term (Knowledge, Skills, and Collaboration)		
1a. KSDE staff and TASN providers demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	KSDE Division of Learning Services staff and TASN providers accurately describe Kansas MTSS and Alignment and how their role supports a district implementation process.	HQPD observation TASN Training Evaluation Content/performance-based assessment
1b. KSDE staff and TASN providers collaborate to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	KSDE staff and TASN providers jointly develop products, protocols, and guidance designed to support the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	Document review
2a. LEA educators demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	School leadership team members accurately describe Kansas MTSS and Alignment and demonstrate skills (e.g., focused conversations about data) that support implementation.	Content/performance-based assessment HQPD observation
2b. LEA educators collaborate to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	Collaborative teams reflect on progress and track their implementation.	HQPD observation Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner
Medium-Term (Installation of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices)		
1c. KSDE and TASN leadership create the conditions that facilitate implementation.	KSDE and TASN products, protocols, and guidance support the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	TASN Coordination/Evaluation Feedback Survey TASN Training Evaluation HQPD observation Stakeholder involvement/feedback
1d. KSDE and TASN leadership make data-based decisions and share data through communication loops.	Decisions are grounded in data and shared effectively through KSDE and TASN structures.	Document review Observation at mid-year and TASN Leadership Team meetings Stakeholder involvement/feedback

2c. District and school administrators create the conditions that facilitate implementation.	District/school-developed products, protocols, and guidance support the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	Checklist for Implementation Readiness Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale
2d. District and school leadership teams and grade-level collaborative teams make data-based decisions and share data through communication loops.	Decisions are grounded in data and shared effectively through district structures.	Checklist for Implementation Readiness Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner
Long-Term (Implementation of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices With Fidelity)		
2e. An evidence-based reading curriculum is implemented with fidelity.	An evidence-based reading curriculum is implemented with fidelity.	Checklist for Implementation Readiness Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner
2f. Evidence-based interventions in reading are provided based on universal screening data and decision protocols.	Established decision protocols are followed and the effectiveness of interventions in reading is regularly monitored.	Checklist for Implementation Readiness Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner
2g. Families are engaged in the data-based decision making and progress monitoring processes for their children.	Families are collaborative partners with school staff in the data-based decision making that impacts their child.	Family Engagement Survey
Impact (Student Outcomes)		
2h. Students make progress in reading achievement.	Students improve their reading proficiency (i.e., accuracy, fluency, comprehension).	Grade-level CBM-GOM universal screening Tier 2/3 progress monitoring
SiMR: 2i. Increased percentage of students with disabilities in grades K-5 score at grade level in reading as measured by CBM-GOMs.	Students with disabilities in grades K-5 score at grade level in reading.	Grade-level CBM-GOM universal screening

Evaluation Measures:

Below are descriptions of the Kansas SSIP evaluation measures. The measures are designed to continually improve implementation through self-correcting feedback. Ongoing coaching and professional learning support deeper implementation through data-based decision making.

HQPD Observation: The High-Quality Professional Development (HQPD) observation is completed by the TASN Evaluation Team at a representative sample of KSDE and TASN trainings, workshops, conferences, and institutes (approximately 50 events annually). The observation addresses adult learning principles, skill development, and transfer to practice indicators in the domains of Preparation, Introduction, Demonstration, Engagement, Evaluation/Reflection, and Mastery. A description of the training content or activity that met each of the 22 indicators is documented. Professional development providers receive feedback on each observed training, and coaching is provided to improve professional development practices. HQPD observations are completed across the year with the goal that every professional

learning topic and every trainer is observed at least once annually. The TASN Evaluation Team follows a standard scoring protocol and annually participates in an interrater reliability process to ensure consistent and accurate observation data.

Content/Performance-Based Assessment: Completed at professional learning events across the year, content-based assessments include pre/post multiple-choice tests and performance-based assessments. Additionally, these assessments for KSDE staff and TASN providers ask participants to describe how their role supports Kansas MTSS and Alignment district implementation process.

TASN Training Evaluation: Completed at professional learning events across the year, the training evaluation includes general satisfaction items and identification of support necessary from KSDE or the TASN provider to facilitate implementation. Additionally, the TASN Training Evaluation includes items aligned with the HQPD observation and adult learning principles (e.g., The trainer provided examples of the content/practice in use; During the training, I had opportunities to practice new skills).

Document Review: The document review provides data on the collaborative development and data-based decisions that result from collaborative efforts. The document review includes participation, meeting minutes, and products developed by the Division of Learning Services committees and state-level stakeholder groups (i.e., Kansas State Board of Education, Accreditation Advisory Council, ESEA Advisory Council, Special Education Advisory Council, and TASN Leadership Team and Provider Meetings). Decision points are analyzed to determine whether decisions were based on data, support the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, and were shared through communication loops. The review of approximately 100 documents occurs annually in July.

Observation at Mid-Year and TASN Leadership Team Meetings: Provider-specific progress monitoring and data-based decision making meetings are held annually with each TASN project (approximately 15 meetings). An observation protocol is completed at each of these meetings to document the inclusion of data-informed decisions. Additionally, quarterly, this protocol is utilized in the observation of TASN Leadership Team meetings to document data-informed decisions.

Stakeholder Involvement/Feedback: The KSDE strives to create conditions that support stakeholder involvement by discussing evaluation results with stakeholder groups and obtaining feedback to guide implementation and support continual improvement. The results of stakeholder feedback are monitored through the document review.

TASN Coordination/Evaluation Feedback Survey: Completed annually by TASN providers, this survey includes satisfaction items and open-ended items to identify the supports necessary to facilitate implementation and collaboration. The results of this survey are used to inform decisions as evidenced by the document review and observations at TASN Leadership Team meetings.

Checklist for Implementation Readiness: Completed by Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, the Checklist for Implementation Readiness provides an ongoing record of Kansas MTSS and Alignment installation in each district/school (e.g., date when each required

component has been completed). The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers determine the installation of MTSS core components through on-site observations, facilitated data-informed discussions and school/district documentation. If an MTSS core component is not developed to the Kansas MTSS and Alignment standard, the Checklist for Implementation Readiness documents why the school did not meet that threshold. It determines fidelity of installation and helps identify modifications to professional learning and coaching supports. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers follow a standard protocol for scoring, and the template automatically creates a summarized graph highlighting areas of strength and areas of continued structuring for each school.

Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale: Completed annually in winter, the Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale is a self-report and stakeholder fidelity assessment of all instructional staff and administrators in each MTSS building and is aligned with the Checklist for Implementation Readiness and the Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner. It determines individual and collaborative implementation, social validity, and teachers' perceptions of administrative support and districtwide implementation. Data are validated through the Checklist for Implementation Readiness. It supports school and district decision making as well as customized coaching.

Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner: The Collaborative Team Progress Planner is completed twice per year by collaborative teams in a school to identify the implementation and effectiveness of universal, supplemental, and intensive supports and to strategize improvements. An automatically-generated summary is provided to the school leadership team to support collaborative teams, school, and district decision making, improvement planning, and customized coaching.

Family Engagement Survey: The Family Engagement Survey provides annual feedback from families on perceptions of engagement, which address each Kansas Family Engagement Standard, to inform school implementation and collaborative efforts.

Tier 2/3 progress monitoring: The performance of students receiving Tier 2 or 3 interventions is monitored on a weekly to monthly basis. Decision rules are followed to determine when a student exits the intervention. These data are reviewed by Collaborative Teams and summarized in the Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner.

CBM-GOM Universal Screening Data in Reading: Reading CBM-GOM screening is conducted in fall, winter, and spring. Student and grade-level composite data support customized coaching and collaborative team, school, and district decision making. These data are reviewed by District Leadership Teams, Building Leadership Teams, and Collaborative Teams and summarized in the Kansas MTSS and Alignment Collaborative Team Progress Planner.

Appendix D
Kansas SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategy Activity Timeline and Status

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.		
Activity	Timeline	Status
1.1. Redesign the Kansas TASN system of technical assistance and professional learning essential scopes of work.	FFY14	Completed
1.2 Realign the Kansas TASN priorities, operating principles, scopes of work and allocate resources to address emerging needs identified by stakeholders.	FFY14	Completed
1.3. Redesign Kansas TASN application process; establish new system priorities, common definitions, shared provider expectations and use new methods to monitor delivery of professional learning and technical assistance.	FFY15	Completed & Ongoing
1.4. 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.	FFY16	Initiated & Ongoing
Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0: Design, implement and evaluate a school improvement planning process built upon Kansas MTSS and Alignment to increase the district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities.		
Activity	Timeline	Status
2.1. Establish and fund the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project charged with implementing a school improvement planning process built upon Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs focusing on districts with demonstrated needs to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities.	FFY15	Completed
2.2. Assess and refine materials to ensure effective and efficient training of district personnel in Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	FFY15	Completed
2.3. Select, train and coach Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers to increase the capacity of districts for providing sustainable Kansas MTSS and Alignment implementation across educational settings.	FFY15-FFY19	Completed & Ongoing
2.4. Implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment training system with a cohort of districts who have a demonstrated need to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities and readiness to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment.	FFY15-FFY19	Initiated & Ongoing
Kansas Coherent Improvement Strategy 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.		
Activity	Timeline	Status
3.1. 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.	FFY15-FFY19	Initiated & Ongoing
3.2. Measure the extent to which the coherent improvement strategies are implemented.	FFY15-FFY19	Initiated & Ongoing
3.3. Establish principles for monitoring fidelity and performance informed by implementation science & IDEA Pt. D State Personnel Development Grant (KS SPDG) evaluation.	FFY15	Completed & Ongoing
3.4. Utilize guided feedback from stakeholders to help determine implementation and sustained use of evidence-based reading practices over time.	FFY15-FFY19	Initiated & Ongoing

Appendix E
Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition	Location/Source
State Teams/Activities		
Division of Learning Services	The Division of Learning Services oversees all federal and statewide education and services in the areas of: Teacher Licensure, Federal Title Programs, Career and Technical Education, and School Accreditation. In addition, the division oversees the state's curriculum standards; the state assessments; and research, data analysis, and reporting requirements. Staff ensures compliance with all state and federal education legislation including the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA).	http://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services
Special Education and Title Services team	The Special Education and Title Services team provides effective, evidence-based technical assistance to districts and schools across the state. The team supports all Kansas students, early childhood through secondary, in meeting or exceeding Kansas Standards. This includes the development, implementation, and continuous improvement of the monitoring process that ensures compliance with federal and state laws and administrative regulations, including the engagement of the student, families, and the community.	https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Special-Education-and-Title-Services
Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) model	Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA), approved by the Kansas State Board of Education in June of 2016, employs a systems approach to school improvement, accrediting systems instead of schools. It requires systems (public school districts and accredited private schools) to engage in a transparent, data-based process of system-wide needs assessment, goal setting, implementation, and reflection. Relationships, Relevance, Responsive Culture, and Rigor are the four areas in which education systems assess overall and individual school performance. In the KESA model, each education system consults with an outside visitation team of experienced education professionals throughout the cycle, culminating in an official accreditation visit in Year 5, followed by the outside visitation team's recommendation of a rating.	http://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Teacher-Licensure-and-Accreditation/K-12-Accreditation-Home/KESA
Kansas State Board of Education	The Mission of the Kansas State Board of Education is to prepare Kansas students for lifelong success through rigorous, quality academic instruction, career training, and character development according to each student's gifts and talents. The Kansas State Board of Education consists of 10 elected members, each representing a district comprised of four contiguous senatorial districts. Board members serve four-year terms with an overlapping schedule. Every other year, the Board reorganizes to elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson. It also appoints a Commissioner of Education who serves as its executive director.	http://www.ksde.org/Board
Kansas State Board of Education Vision and Outcomes	The Vision of the Kansas State Board of Education is that Kansas leads the world in the success of each student. This is referred to as the Kansans Can Vision. Five outcomes are used to measure progress: social-emotional growth, kindergarten readiness, individual plans of study, high school graduation, and postsecondary success.	https://www.ksde.org/Board/Kansas-State-Board-of-Education/Board-Goals-and-Outcomes

Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE)	The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) is a dynamic, dedicated service agency that provides leadership, resources, support, and accountability to the state's pre-K through 12 education system. KSDE administers the state's governance of education, standards and assessments, special education services, child nutrition and wellness, title programs and services, career and technical education, and financial aid. It is the goal of the agency to provide all Kansas children with equal access to a quality, high-level education that promotes student achievement and prepares all students for global success. The department is governed by the Kansas State Board of Education, but the day-to-day administration of the agency is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Education, who is appointed by the Board.	http://www.ksde.org/Home/Quick-Links/About-Us
KSDE Kansans Can School Redesign project	In support of Kansas' vision for education, the KSDE Kansans Can School Redesign project supports schools to be redesigned around the five outcomes established by the Kansas State Board of Education, the five elements identified as defining a successful Kansas high school graduate, and what Kansans said they want their schools to look like in the future.	https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Fiscal-and-Administrative-Services/Communications-and-Recognition-Programs/Vision-Kansans-Can/School-Redesign
KESA Advisory Council or KSDE Accreditation Advisory Council	The Accreditation Advisory Council reviews and provides input to KSDE staff concerning systems accreditation documents and procedures. It advises KSDE staff of field needs, concerns, and issues; acts as K-12 accreditation advocates in the field and as liaisons to other groups; and provides advice and counsel to the Kansas State Board of Education on issues of policy, such as regulations, corrective action plans, sanctions, and levels of accreditation. The council is made up of 30 voting and eight non-voting members who are selected from a pool of eligible applicants. The voting members consists of the Kansas Commissioner of Education and two each from the following groups: superintendents; central office staff; high school administrators; middle school administrators; elementary school administrators; high school, middle school, and elementary school certified staff; and business and industry representatives. In addition, one voting member is selected from each of the following groups: classified staff, special purpose schools, private/religious schools, parents, LEA Boards of Education, special education, higher education professors, higher education administrators, equity and diversity in education representatives, technology in education representatives, and postsecondary vocational/technical representatives.	http://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Teacher-Licensure-and-Accreditation/K-12-Accreditation-Home/Quality-Performance-Accreditation-QPA/QPA-Advisory-Council
KSDE Data Quality Assurance	The KSDE Data Quality Assurance policy includes training and data certification of district staff. The Data quality certification program provides specialized tracks for data entry personnel, data coordinators, program staff, and administrators. These tracks include instruction on general data quality practices and techniques, as well as intensive role-based training with the KSDE web-based applications.	http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/SEAS/KIAS/spp/APR14-ks-2014b.pdf
Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)	The Kansas Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) provides policy guidance to the State Board of Education with respect to special education and related services for students with disabilities. The SEAC meets as mandated by both the State and Federal Legislation. SEAC membership is made up of stakeholders throughout the state with the majority being individuals with disabilities and parents of children with disabilities. The State Board of Education makes the appointments to vacated positions on the SEAC during the month of June each year.	https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Special-Education-and-Title-Services/Special-Education/Special-Education-Advisory-Council
TASN and LEA Teams		

Building Leadership Team	The Building Leadership Team leads building-level school improvement, including facilitating a needs assessment, establishing goals, developing an action plan for each goal, guiding the implementation of the action plans focused on successful outcomes for all learners, analyzing the effectiveness of implementation, ensuring continual improvement and sustainability of the system, and developing the instructional capacity of the staff to lead the change process.	https://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1036/BuildingLeadershipTeam_Considerations.pdf
District Leadership Team	The District Leadership Team leads district-level system improvement by overseeing and approving building-level work, facilitating a system-wide needs assessment, establishing district goals, developing an action plan for each goal, guiding the implementation of the action plans focusing on successful outcomes for all learners, analyzing the effectiveness of implementation, ensuring continual districtwide improvement and sustainability of the system, and developing the instructional capacity of the staff to lead the change process.	https://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1037/DistrictLeadershipTeam_Considerations.pdf
Kansas Learning Network	The Kansas Learning Network is dedicated to supporting schools in implementing effective practices resulting in successful outcomes for all learners by providing technical assistance for eligible ESEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools and districts through sustained coaching in a rigorous and collaborative systems change process. Kansas Learning Network coaches work closely with school leadership teams to complete a comprehensive needs assessment focusing on root causes, data analysis, risk factors, and expansion of successful elements of the school system. Schools and districts then develop and carry out action plans to modify their infrastructure to improve outcomes for all learners.	https://ksdetasn.org/kln http://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1980/2017-18_KLN_Evaluation_Brief.pdf
Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) and Alignment	Kansas MTSS and Alignment is a pre-kindergarten through college and career ready districtwide approach for school districts across Kansas to improve academic achievement, positive behavior, and strong social skills for every student. Kansas MTSS and Alignment is a coherent continuum of evidence-based, system-wide practices to support a rapid response to academic and behavioral needs, with frequent data-based monitoring for instructional decision making to empower each Kansas student to achieve high standards.	https://ksdetasn.org/mtss/overview
Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) and Alignment Training System	Since 2009, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project has provided multi-phase training and ongoing support for districts (including pre-K through high school) to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment. The project aligns trainings with the needs of schools in Kansas and the team strives to make sure their work enhances district capacity to meet multiple demands in the areas of assessment, reporting, and the requirements within the accreditation process in Kansas. By working closely with departments providing policy and guidance in these areas, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project assists districts in streamlining data collection and utilizing data to make informed decisions regarding student needs. Kansas MTSS and Alignment is an overarching framework that guides schools through a process of needs assessment and decision making that assists in not only selecting effective practices, but also creating a sustainable, aligned structure.	https://ksdetasn.org/mtss/overview https://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1886/2017-18_Kansas_MTSS_Evaluation_Brief.pdf

Kansas IDEA Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC)	The Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC) promotes meaningful family engagement at all levels of education and provides information and resources to help parents, educators, and other organizations promote the educational success of each Kansas child. KPIRC supports Kansas schools by developing resources to promote family-school-community partnerships, offering professional learning to educators and families, and providing technical assistance on the development of family-friendly policies and programs, networking with community organizations to support family engagement in education and supporting early learning programs to promote school readiness.	https://ksdetasn.org/kpirc/kansas-parent-information-resource-center http://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1894/2017-18_KPIRC_Evaluation_Brief.pdf
Kansas Parent Training and Information Center (Kansas PTI)	The Kansas Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) assists families whose children have disabilities to be partners in their child's services and education. Families Together, Inc. has been the PTI Center for Kansas since 1986. As the PTI, Families Together is able to serve families of any child with a disability who receives early intervention or special education services in the state. Their training and support for families is centered on helping families to become true partners with their child's team to create a set of services to provide the child or youth with a free appropriate public education.	https://familiesaltogetherinc.org/about-us/
TASN Coordination project/team	The TASN Coordination project collaborates with the KSDE Special Education and Title Services leadership to enact and maintain the vision of the Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) and to provide oversight and monitoring of the overall TASN. It assists the Special Education and Title Services leadership in ensuring a consistency of vision, message, and technical assistance from all TASN providers, consistently focused on increasing the capacity of educators to implement evidence-based practices.	https://ksdetasn.org/tasn http://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1978/2017-18_Coordination_Evaluation_Brief.pdf
TASN Evaluation project/team	The TASN Evaluation project assists the entire TASN system in designing and implementing an evaluation system that focuses on measuring the effectiveness, implementation, and sustainability of efforts. This ensures that the supports and services accessed by educators via TASN are effective and have a positive impact on staff behavior and student outcomes. The evaluation of TASN contributes to the continuous improvement of TASN professional development by creating data-informed, self-correcting feedback loops. To this end, the TASN evaluation is an ongoing, collaborative process that enhances the expertise of KSDE and TASN providers and builds the data analysis competence of teachers, administrators, and coaches who are charged with implementing evidence-based instructional practices.	https://ksdetasn.org/evaluation http://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1979/2017-18_Evaluation_Evaluation_Brief.pdf
Technical Assistance System Network (TASN)	The Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) is the system that KSDE uses to increase capacity of districts to implement and sustain evidence-based practices. Through collaboration with numerous professional development providers, the TASN system delivers training, coaching, and technical assistance in effective practices addressing instruction in academics, behavior, social-emotional learning, and family engagement across the state. TASN includes the projects that facilitate Kansas MTSS and Alignment, Comprehensive Support and Improvement, and family engagement specifically discussed in this report.	https://www.ksdetasn.org/tasn/about-tasn https://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/1887/2017-18_TASN_Evaluation_Brief.pdf

Accessibility Report

Filename: FFY2018 Kansas Year 4 SSIP Report 121219.pdf

Report created by: KSDE TASN using Adobe Acrobat Pro DC on January 17, 2020

Organization:

Summary

The checker found no problems in this document.

- Needs manual check: 0
- Passed manually: 2
- Failed manually: 0
- Skipped: 1
- Passed: 29
- Failed: 0

Detailed Report

Document

Rule Name	Status	Description
Accessibility permission flag	Passed	Accessibility permission flag must be set
Image-only PDF	Passed	Document is not image-only PDF
Tagged PDF	Passed	Document is tagged PDF
Logical Reading Order	Passed manually	Document structure provides a logical reading order
Primary language	Passed	Text language is specified
Title	Passed	Document title is showing in title bar
Bookmarks	Passed	Bookmarks are present in large documents
Color contrast	Passed manually	Document has appropriate color contrast

Page Content

Rule Name	Status	Description
Tagged content	Passed	All page content is tagged
Tagged annotations	Passed	All annotations are tagged
Tab order	Passed	Tab order is consistent with structure order
Character encoding	Passed	Reliable character encoding is provided
Tagged multimedia	Passed	All multimedia objects are tagged
Screen flicker	Passed	Page will not cause screen flicker
Scripts	Passed	No inaccessible scripts
Timed responses	Passed	Page does not require timed responses
Navigation links	Passed	Navigation links are not repetitive

Forms

Rule Name	Status	Description
Tagged form fields	Passed	All form fields are tagged
Field descriptions	Passed	All form fields have description

Alternate Text

Rule Name	Status	Description
Figures alternate text	Passed	Figures require alternate text
Nested alternate text	Passed	Alternate text that will never be read
Associated with content	Passed	Alternate text must be associated with some content
Hides annotation	Passed	Alternate text should not hide annotation
Other elements alternate text	Passed	Other elements that require alternate text

Tables

Rule Name	Status	Description

Rows	Passed	TR must be a child of Table, THead, TBody, or TFoot
TH and TD	Passed	TH and TD must be children of TR
Headers	Passed	Tables should have headers
Regularity	Passed	Tables must contain the same number of columns in each row and rows in each column
Summary	Skipped	Tables must have a summary

Lists

Rule Name	Status	Description
List items	Passed	LI must be a child of L
Lbl and LBody	Passed	Lbl and LBody must be children of LI

Headings

Rule Name	Status	Description
Appropriate nesting	Passed	Appropriate nesting

[Back to Top](#)