

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Kansas



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

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- 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). TASN provides districts a wide array of no or low-cost support and evidence-based professional development that is essential to increasing adult capacity, preventing educational inequity, and establishing inclusive, safe and supportive learning environments.

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 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. The TASN evidence-based professional development priorities include flexible services, resources and supports for general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, family members, administrators, and support service professionals.

The TASN providers include staff from KSDE Early Childhood and Special Education and Title Services Teams, IDEA 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. Multiple funding sources assist districts in expanding services, improving educator skills, and providing quality professional development based on needs identified through analysis of statewide data. Federal investments include IDEA VI-B, ESEA Title I, 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 children 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). Identified TASN priorities make available the evidence-based professional development that is essential to increasing adult capacity, preventing educational inequity, and establishing inclusive, safe and supportive learning environments. 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 TASN providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities 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 are informed through the use of data from self correcting feedback loops. 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 through analysis of statewide data. Federal investments include IDEA VI-B, ESEA Title I, and State Personnel Development Grant funding.

More TASN information is at www.ksdetasn.org.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

3,199

Parent Members Engagement:

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

Kansas provided several opportunities through multiple methods for Kansas parents to engage in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff held a meeting with all Kansas parent training and information center staff (Families Together) to review the learning materials designed to build stakeholder capacity, review the historical and trend data visualizations, and solicit feedback not just through the stakeholder feedback survey, but also through open discussion. The most valuable part of this meeting, for KSDE staff, was the guidance Families Together provided on connecting and engaging with families, not just in the upcoming stakeholder meetings for families, but on the SPP/APR on an ongoing basis. Families Together hosted multiple parent meetings and provided an opportunity to share on this topic during the keynote presentation at its annual statewide family conference. The parent meetings were held during the traditional lunch hour and in the evening to provide families with the opportunity to attend a meeting that fit their schedule. KSDE staff reviewed the learning materials designed to build stakeholder capacity and historical and trend data visualizations. KSDE staff encouraged families to provide feedback via the stakeholder feedback survey and through open discussion at these meetings. KSDE staff encouraged families to share their stories, within the context of relevant indicators, because that is valuable information that can be used to develop improvement strategies and evaluate progress. Families Together provided an opportunity for KSDE staff to share the learning materials designed to build stakeholder capacity and historical and trend data visualizations with a group of individuals training to be education advocates. The group mainly consisted of foster parents and also included several retired special educators.

Kansas described how parent members of the State Advisory Panel were engaged in this process, through multiple meetings, in the above Broad Stakeholder Input section. Parents from local and statewide advocacy groups were included in the stakeholder information distribution, as described in the above Broad Stakeholder Input section. As part of requesting stakeholder feedback, Kansas provided its 1-800 number as an option for stakeholders to provide feedback via a voice recording if they did not have access to the internet to take the stakeholder feedback survey or just wanted another medium to share their story and their input.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

To build the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities, Kansas created clear and consistent learning materials about all SPP/APR indicators with changes that included requirements for target setting, requirements for each indicator, the data source for each indicator, historical data for each indicator, proposed improvement strategies,

information on the impact of COVID-19 on the indicator data when relevant, proposed targets for each indicator, and information on how targets were determined. To give stakeholders the opportunity to analyze indicator data in an interactive way, Kansas created a Tableau Public site with data visualizations for each results indicator that provided detailed information on historical data and its comparison to state targets, an interactive data visualization that allowed stakeholders to select the baseline year and proposed targets to see the comparison to historical data and projected future trends, and proposed targets. To collect stakeholder input, Kansas primarily used an online survey to collect feedback on the proposed targets and demographic information on the respondents. Kansas also provided an opportunity for an open-ended response on each indicator where stakeholders could share narrative feedback on suggested improvement strategies, evaluating progress, and the opportunity to share their story within the context of that indicator.

Additionally, the live, virtual parent meetings and in-person education advocate meeting provided the opportunity for KSDE staff to share information and dialogue with families about the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. These are important conversations that must continue on a regular basis to inform KSDE as it works to further adjust the systems it has in place to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

The mechanisms Kansas employed for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress are described above, in the Broad Stakeholder Input section. Kansas officially sought public input from mid-March 2021 through mid-September 2021. Kansas recognizes the importance of continuing to solicit public input on proposed targets and to engage stakeholders in analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress and will continue to do this throughout the remaining SPP/APR cycle. In the Spring and Summer of 2022 additional public input on setting new targets for Indicators 2, 8, 14 and 17 will occur based upon results of revised data collection methodologies.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

To make the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation of progress available to the public, Kansas utilized a similar learning pathway that it designed to seek diverse stakeholder input. Kansas created clear and consistent information to assist stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, the final targets, and proposed improvement strategies; provided historical and projected data, including continuing to provide the opportunity for stakeholders to interact with created data visualizations to consider the impact of changing targets; and the results of targeted feedback on the proposed targets. The survey results were posted, along with aggregate demographic information on survey respondents.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway sharing the results with the public broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced earlier; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

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 2019 performance of each district on the indicator targets is available to the public at the KSDE website, datacentral.ksde.org/sped_rpts.aspx. A complete copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR and other related documents are available at the KSDE website, <http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=520> and OSEP's State Performance Plans (SPP) Letters and Annual Performance Report (APR) Letters page, <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/KS-B-SPPAPR-FFY19.docx>. 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

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data¹

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	84.54%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.75%	85.75%
Data	77.29%	77.52%	78.37%	80.02%	78.4% ²

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	84.54%	81.00%	81.90%	82.80%	83.70%	84.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities

¹ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

² Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,434
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	55
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	573

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,434	4,062	78.4% ³	84.54%	84.54%	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

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

The 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

³ Percentage blurred due to privacy protection

1 - OSEP Response

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

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

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

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

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	2.46%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	2.40%	2.40%	2.38%	2.32%	2.32%
Data	2.75%	2.57%	2.66%	2.36%	2.52%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	2.32%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and

analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,434
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	55
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	573

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 2020 Kansas chose the OSEP Option 2 using the same data source and measurement that was used for the FFY 2019 APR submitted in February 2021. 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 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total Grade 9-12 Special Education Enrollment Count	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
477	23,800	2.52%	2.32%	2.00%	Met 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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	93.05%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	89.14%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	84.38%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	93.98%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	89.85%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	85.23%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	5,042	4,508	4,234
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,367	1,910	1,586
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,034	1,826	1,738
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	312	294	258

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	5,866	5,024	4,509
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,397	1,988	1,594
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,802	2,232	1,989

d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	314	294	260
---	-----	-----	-----

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4,713	5,042		95.00%	93.47%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,030	4,508		95.00%	89.40%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,582	4,234		95.00%	84.60%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5,513	5,866		95.00%	93.98%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,514	5,024		95.00%	89.85%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,843	4,509		95.00%	85.23%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Kansas reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.160(f). To view this data, please go to the Kansas Building Report Card – Participation Summary Report, located at https://ksreportcard.ksde.org/part_details.aspx?org_no=State& rptType=3. In the box "Select Organization", choose a school, district, or State Totals. In the box "Selections", choose a subject, ELA, math or science, from the dropdown on the right and an option for All Assessments, General with Accommodations, and DLM.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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

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

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	21.45%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	6.45%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	6.02%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	13.16%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	4.76%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	3.32%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	21.45%	21.45%	21.81%	22.16%	22.52%	22.87%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	6.45%	6.45%	6.57%	6.70%	6.82%	6.94%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	6.02%	6.02%	6.22%	6.43%	6.63%	6.83%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	13.16%	13.16%	13.31%	13.46%	13.61%	13.76%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.76%	4.76%	4.90%	5.05%	5.19%	5.33%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.32%	3.32%	3.41%	3.50%	3.58%	3.67%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	4,401	3,736	3,324
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	794	222	180
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	150	19	20

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	5,199	4,220	3,583
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	583	179	104
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or	101	22	15

above proficient against grade level			
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	944	4,401		21.45%	21.45%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	241	3,736		6.45%	6.45%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	200	3,324		6.02%	6.02%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	684	5,199		13.16%	13.16%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	201	4,220		4.76%	4.76%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	119	3,583		3.32%	3.32%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

None

3B - OSEP Response

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

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

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	43.91%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	22.11%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	15.89%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	19.75%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	10.54%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	14.23%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	43.91%	43.91%	45.53%	47.14%	48.76%	50.37%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	22.11%	22.11%	22.83%	23.55%	24.26%	24.98%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	15.89%	15.89%	16.82%	17.74%	18.67%	19.60%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.75%	19.75%	20.26%	20.77%	21.27%	21.78%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	10.54%	10.54%	11.13%	11.71%	12.30%	12.89%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	14.23%	14.23%	14.41%	14.59%	14.77%	14.95%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	312	294	258
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	137	65	41

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	314	294	260
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	62	31	37

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	137	312		43.91%	43.91%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	65	294		22.11%	22.11%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	41	258		15.89%	15.89%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	62	314		19.75%	19.75%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	31	294		10.54%	10.54%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	37	260		14.23%	14.23%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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

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

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	26.06
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	17.74
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	21.22
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	19.25
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	15.51
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	16.73

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	26.06	26.06	25.65	25.25	24.84	24.43
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	17.74	17.74	17.28	16.82	16.35	15.89
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	21.22	21.22	20.91	20.61	20.30	19.99
Math	A <=	Grade 4	19.25	19.25	19.07	18.88	18.69	18.51
Math	B <=	Grade 8	15.51	15.51	15.32	15.14	14.95	14.76
Math	C <=	Grade HS	16.73	16.73	16.64	16.55	16.45	16.36

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the:

(1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	30,572	32,552	30,490
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	4,401	3,736	3,324
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	14,225	7,831	8,232
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	300	45	74
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	794	222	180
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	150	19	20

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	31,956	33,328	31,095

b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,199	4,220	3,583
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,141	6,683	6,178
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	215	72	57
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	583	179	104
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	101	22	15

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.45%	47.51%		26.06	26.06	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6.45%	24.20%		17.74	17.74	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	6.02%	27.24%		21.22	21.22	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.16%	32.41%		19.25	19.25	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4.76%	20.27%		15.51	15.51	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3.32%	20.05%		16.73	16.73	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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

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

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.70%	0.00%	0.70%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

20

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	266	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 2% 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)

KSDE changed the baseline due to the methodology change. After stakeholder input and public comment and hearing, KSDE changed the definition of significant discrepancy from 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 to any district that suspends at least 10 special education students of a given race or ethnicity and suspends 2% or more of students with IEPs of a given race or ethnicity for more than 10 days.

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

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

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)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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

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

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.35%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

20

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	266	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 2% 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)

KSDE changed the baseline due to the methodology change. After stakeholder input and public comment and hearing, KSDE changed the definition of significant discrepancy from 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 to any district that suspends at least 10 special education students of a given race or ethnicity and suspends 2% or more of students with IEPs of a given race or ethnicity for more than 10 days.

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

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

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 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

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

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	
A	70.25%	Data	68.91%	68.93%	68.47%	68.83%	70.25%
B	2019	Target <=	7.35%	7.34%	7.32%	7.30%	
B	7.04%	Data	6.97%	7.41%	7.26%	7.12%	7.04%
C	2019	Target <=	2.50%	2.48%	2.46%	2.43%	
C	2.21%	Data	2.20%	2.25%	2.32%	2.34%	2.21%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	70.50%	70.75%	71.00%	71.25%	71.50%	71.75%
Target B <=	7.02%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	6.95%
Target C <=	2.20%	2.19%	2.18%	2.17%	2.16%	2.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences

within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	68,488
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	49,570
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,397
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,101
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	104
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	131

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	49,570	68,488	70.25%	70.50%	72.38%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,397	68,488	7.04%	7.02%	6.42%	Met target	No Slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,336	68,488	2.21%	2.20%	1.95%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	38.50%	38.75%	38.91%	39.00%	
A	Data	37.23%	37.79%	37.90%	38.74%	40.14%
B	Target <=	32.75%	32.50%	31.99%	31.75%	
B	Data	33.53%	34.92%	34.58%	32.15%	36.96%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	40.14%
B	2019	36.96%
C	2020	1.98%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	37.36%	38.33%	39.30%	40.27%	41.24%	42.21%
Target B <=	39.36%	38.10%	36.84%	35.58%	34.32%	33.06%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.98%	1.96%	1.94%	1.92%	1.90%	1.88%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

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

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,579	3,833	1,383	7,795
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	885	1,502	525	2,912
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,159	1,429	455	3,043
b2. Number of children attending separate school	10	8	7	25

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	82	46	26	154

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,912	7,795	40.14%	37.36%	37.36%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,068	7,795	36.96%	39.36%	39.36%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	154	7,795		1.98%	1.98%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State established baseline for Indicator 6C, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

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

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	86.50%	86.65%	86.75%	87.00%	87.00%
A1	85.93%	Data	88.13%	89.42%	90.68%	88.56%	89.63%
A2	2008	Target >=	66.40%	66.60%	66.80%	67.00%	67.00%

A2	65.16%	Data	65.52%	63.34%	65.94%	63.37%	61.87%
B1	2008	Target >=	86.45%	86.47%	86.49%	86.50%	86.50%
B1	86.38%	Data	87.53%	89.67%	89.06%	89.69%	87.61%
B2	2008	Target >=	63.00%	63.50%	63.75%	64.00%	64.00%
B2	63.60%	Data	63.31%	61.79%	63.03%	62.25%	60.22%
C1	2008	Target >=	87.40%	87.60%	87.80%	88.00%	88.00%
C1	86.24%	Data	88.61%	88.77%	90.56%	89.94%	90.12%
C2	2008	Target >=	78.80%	79.00%	79.25%	79.50%	79.50%
C2	76.79%	Data	77.62%	75.76%	78.02%	77.25%	75.76%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	89.63%	89.63%	89.90%	90.17%	90.44%	90.71%
Target A2 >=	61.87%	61.87%	62.70%	63.53%	64.36%	65.19%
Target B1 >=	86.50%	86.50%	86.72%	86.94%	87.16%	87.38%
Target B2 >=	62.25%	62.25%	62.59%	62.93%	63.27%	63.61%
Target C1 >=	90.12%	90.12%	90.36%	90.60%	90.84%	91.08%
Target C2 >=	75.76%	75.76%	76.03%	76.30%	76.57%	76.84%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,754

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	0.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	307	8.18%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,106	29.46%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,396	37.19%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	938	24.99%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,502	2,816	89.63%	89.63%	88.85%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
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>	2,334	3,754	61.87%	61.87%	62.17%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	8	0.21%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	306	8.15%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,150	30.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,358	36.17%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	932	24.83%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,508	2,822	87.61%	86.50%	88.87%	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	2,290	3,754	60.22%	62.25%	61.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	9	0.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	245	6.53%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	676	18.01%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,507	40.14%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,317	35.08%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	2,183	2,437	90.12%	90.12%	89.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	2,824	3,754	75.76%	75.76%	75.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's

redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	33.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	66.00%	66.25%	66.40%	66.50%	66.50%
Data	82.98%	71.25%	60.32%	69.94%	72.25%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	66.50%	66.60%	66.70%	66.80%	66.90%	67.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
998	1,274	72.25%	66.50%	78.34%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

5,851

Percentage of respondent parents

21.77%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	5.23%	21.77%

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

The response rate increased 16.54 percentage points from 2019-20 to 2020-21. Further, the number of respondents in each of the represented ethnicities increased from 2019-20 to 2020-21. KSDE is working to continue these trends. Some activities that KSDE has implemented for FFY 2021 to improve response rate include:

- Modified survey timelines to increase participation;
- Changing from a sampling methodology to a census;
- Solicited feedback from LEA Communities of Practice, Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), & Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS) Stakeholder group; and
- Asking districts for actions that KSDE and/or districts could take to increase the response rate of parents of non-white students with disabilities as well as students with specific learning disabilities.

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

The response rate increased from 5.23% in FFY 2019 to 21.77% in FFY 2020. An increase response rate decreases the possibility that nonresponse bias is present.

Significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity, disability, and grade of the child. In terms of race/ethnicity, parents of White students (response rate=22%) and parents of American Indian students (response rate=34%) were more likely to respond than parents of Hispanic students (response rate=13%). In terms of disability, parents of students with a Learning Disability were less likely to respond (response rate=12%) than parents of students with a Developmental Delay (response rate=16%) or parents of students with a Speech/Language Impairment (response rate=21%) or parents of students with Autism (response rate=37%). In terms of grade, parents of students in Preschool were less likely to respond (response rate=13%) than parents of students in grades 7-12 (response rate=22%).

Although there are significant differences in the response rates between race/ethnicity, disability, and grade, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage itself. Because nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses, and there were no significant differences in the positivity of responses between groups for those that did respond, Kansas concludes that nonresponse bias is not present. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in response positivity between those that responded to the survey earlier in the collection window and those parents that responded later in the collection window.

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

The State used statistical significance testing of response rate to determine if one group was over-or under-represented. The survey sample was such that if all disaggregated groups have the same response rate, then by definition, the disaggregated groups are representative of the population. On the other hand, if disaggregated groups have differing response rates, the disaggregated groups will not be representative of the population in terms of racial/ethnic make-up.

No significant differences exist in the parent involvement percentages between these groups of parents, but a few differences in response rates between groups of parents by race/ethnicity, disability, and grade are present. The overall results are representative of the State despite the differences in response rates. Parents of White students and American Indian students had a similar parent involvement percentage as parents of Hispanic students. Furthermore, parents from a wide range of districts from across the state responded to the survey. Thus, the demographics represent all racial/ethnic groups, all disability categories, and all grade levels and reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution.

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

NO

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

Modified survey timelines to increase participation; Changing from a sampling methodology to a census; Solicited feedback from LEA Communities of Practice, Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), & Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS) Stakeholder group; and Asking districts for actions that KSDE and/or districts could take to increase the response rate of parents of non-white students with disabilities as well as students with specific learning disabilities.

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

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The 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.

Kansas used a simple stratified random sample for the Indicator 8 Parent Engagement Survey for all years through FFY2020. Three strata were established using district size, Small (<299), Medium (300-1,724), and Large (1,725-49,999) to ensure representativeness of districts in the state. Statewide sampling was used on an annual basis giving all districts and parents equal opportunity to be randomly selected. No districts in Kansas have more than 50,000 students.

The annual sample size was calculated at a .95 right-sided confident interval, a margin of error of .05, with oversampling to address design effect and historical return rates.

All students included in the December 1 count are included in the sample population. Districts are stratified based on size, and random number assignment to each student in each strata is used to generate the simple stratified random sample. The simple stratified random sample methodology should eliminate selection bias.

The state attempts to prevent missing data by first describing precisely what the State needs to collect, providing technical assistance and then following up with school districts to request missing data. The completeness of data collection will improve after the first year and will continue to improve as long as requirements remain unchanged. All issues of confidentiality will be handled by in accordance with the rules and procedures in FERPA. The Department will also guard against divulging personally identifiable information by not reporting results when there are less than five students for whom data are available or when those results can be easily calculated based on other data provided.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

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

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, the State was required to submit its sampling plan to OSEP and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan. The State provided information about its process for sampling in its narrative; however, the State did not submit its sampling plan, as required.

8 - Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must submit its sampling plan and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.

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

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

5

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	281	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 the target racial and ethnic group in the district; At least 10 students of the target racial and ethnic group in the category being evaluated; At least 10 students in the comparison group in special education and related services; and a final risk ratio ≥ 3.00 in the category being evaluated, except for the category of speech & language which must be ≥ 4.50 .

Year 2

Overrepresentation -The district must have:

At least 30 students of the target racial and ethnic group in the district; at least 10 students of the target racial and ethnic group in the category being evaluated; at least 10 students in the comparison group in special education and related services; and a final risk ratio ≥ 3.00 in the category being evaluated, except for the category of speech & language which must be ≥ 4.50 .

Methodology

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) provides each district with a final risk ratio for overrepresentation. If a district has a final risk ratio ≥ 3.00 in the category being evaluated except for the category of speech & language which must be ≥ 4.50 , the following is implemented:

Year 1 –

KSDE team reviews the submitted information and verifies the year one data calculation. KSDE notifies the district of the data calculation and encourages the district to seek technical assistance to address the numeric discrepancy through a root cause analysis and action planning.

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 IDEA procedures occur and completes a root cause analysis. 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.

KSDE notifies the district that it has disproportionate representation and provides the district with the required Kansas Self-Assessment Tool. KSDE requires the district to use this tool to review its policies, practices and procedures specific to the identified racial and ethnic group and disability category. The district completes the Kansas Self-Assessment Tool and submits it to KSDE along with supporting data 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)

Risk Ratio: Within a USD, the risk ratio answers the question "What is the risk of children from a target racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory as compared to the risk of children from all the Comparison racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory within the USD?"

Risk Ratio Calculation Steps:

1. District Target Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in Target Race/Ethnicity Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in Target Groups)

2. District Comparison Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in all Other Race/Ethnicities Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in all Other Race/Ethnicities Group)

3. Risk Ratio=(District Target Group Risk)/(District Comparison Group Risk)

Alternate Risk Ratio: Within a USD, the risk ratio answers the question "What is the risk of children from a target racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory as compared to the risk of children from all the Comparison racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory within the state?"

Alternate Risk Ratio Calculation Steps:

1. District Target Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in Target Race/Ethnicity Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in Target Groups)

2. State Comparison Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in the state for all Other Race/Ethnicities Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in the state for all Other Race/Ethnicities Group)

3. Alternate Risk Ratio=(District Target Group Risk)/(State Comparison Group Risk)

Risk Ratio: Risk Ratio is reported for each district, disability group and race/ethnicity combination regardless of whether the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N

Size requirements are met.

Alternate Risk Ratio: Alternate Risk Ratio is reported for each district, disability group and race/ethnicity combination regardless of whether the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size requirements are met.

Final Risk Ratio: The Final Risk Ratio is either the Risk Ratio, the Alternate Risk Ratio or there is no Final Risk Ratio.

If the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size requirements are met for the Target and Comparison groups, the Risk Ratio is the Final Risk Ratio. If either the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size Target and Comparison group requirements are not met, the Alternate Risk Ratio is used as the Final Risk Ratio if the Alternate Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size Target and Comparison group requirements are met. There is no Final Risk Ratio if the Risk Ratio Cell Size or N Size Target or Comparison group requirements are not met, or if neither the Alternate Risk Ratio Cell Size or N Size Target nor Comparison group requirements are not met.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

29

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
14	0	257	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 the target racial and ethnic group in the district; At least 10 students of the target racial and ethnic group in the category being evaluated; At least 10 students in the comparison group in special education and related services; and a final risk ratio ≥ 3.00 in the category being evaluated, except for the category of speech & language which must be ≥ 4.50 .

Year 2 -

Overrepresentation -The district must have:

At least 30 students of the target racial and ethnic group in the district; at least 10 students of the target racial and ethnic group in the category being evaluated; at least 10 students in the comparison group in special education and related services; and a final risk ratio ≥ 3.00 in the category being evaluated, except for the category of speech & language which must be ≥ 4.50 .

Methodology

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) provides each district with a final risk ratio for overrepresentation. If a district has a final risk ratio ≥ 3.00 in the category being evaluated except for the category of speech & language which must be ≥ 4.50 , the following is implemented:

Year 1 -

KSDE team reviews the submitted information and verifies the year one data calculation. KSDE notifies the district of the data calculation and encourages the district to seek technical assistance to address the numeric discrepancy through a root cause analysis and action planning.

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 IDEA procedures occur and completes a root cause analysis. 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 the Kansas Self-Assessment Tool and submits it to KSDE along with supporting data 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)

Risk Ratio: Within a USD, the risk ratio answers the question "What is the risk of children from a target racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory as compared to the risk of children from all the Comparison racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory within the USD?"

Risk Ratio Calculation Steps:

1. District Target Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in Target Race/Ethnicity Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in Target Groups)

2. District Comparison Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in all Other Race/Ethnicities Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in all Other Race/Ethnicities Group)

3. Risk Ratio=(District Target Group Risk)/(District Comparison Group Risk)

Alternate Risk Ratio: Within a USD, the risk ratio answers the question "What is the risk of children from a target racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory as compared to the risk of children from all the Comparison racial/ethnic group found within a subcategory within the state?"

Alternate Risk Ratio Calculation Steps:

1. District Target Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in Target Race/Ethnicity Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in Target Groups)
2. State Comparison Group Risk=(Cell Data: # in the state for all Other Race/Ethnicities Group within Category/Subcategory)/(N Data: # in the state for all Other Race/Ethnicities Group)
3. Alternate Risk Ratio=(District Target Group Risk)/(State Comparison Group Risk)

Risk Ratio: Risk Ratio is reported for each district, disability group and race/ethnicity combination regardless of whether the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size requirements are met.

Alternate Risk Ratio: Alternate Risk Ratio is reported for each district, disability group and race/ethnicity combination regardless of whether the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size requirements are met.

Final Risk Ratio: The Final Risk Ratio is either the Risk Ratio, the Alternate Risk Ratio or there is no Final Risk Ratio.

If the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size requirements are met for the Target and Comparison groups, the Risk Ratio is the Final Risk Ratio. If either the Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size Target and Comparison group requirements are not met, the Alternate Risk Ratio is used as the Final Risk Ratio if the Alternate Risk Ratio Cell Size and N Size Target and Comparison group requirements are met.

There is no Final Risk Ratio if the Risk Ratio Cell Size or N Size Target or Comparison group requirements are not met, or if neither the Alternate Risk Ratio Cell Size or N Size Target nor Comparison group requirements are not met.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.86%	99.74%	99.66%	99.78%	99.55%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,694	2,670	99.55%	100%	99.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

24

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 the timeline 1-74 days. Reasons for delay: Miscalculation of days, Provider and staff error, school building closures due to COVID-19 interruption

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 State Department of Education (KSDE) collects Eligible and Not Eligible Initial Evaluations in an authenticated database system. The districts were required to report the actual number of days for each Initial Evaluation in the random sample. If the Initial Evaluation extended beyond the state established timeline, the district was required to report a reason the Initial Evaluation went beyond the timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2019 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 2019 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 2019 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 2019 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 2019

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

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2)

has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	72.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.85%	99.52%	99.69%	99.87%	99.82%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,083
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	22

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,938
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.	74
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	46
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,938	1,941	99.82%	100%	99.85%	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: 22-149

Reasons for Delay:

School building closures due to COVID-19 interruption

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 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2019 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 2019 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 2019 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 2019 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 2019

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

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

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	99.84%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.74%	99.33%	99.52%	99.15%	99.80%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,469	2,492	99.80%	100%	99.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) uses the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) Checklist to monitor data from all LEAs each year through collect data through an authenticated database system.

Question	Yes / No
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 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance for FFY2019 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 web application that each district, including juvenile and adult correction facilities, and state schools, with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY2019 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 FFY2019 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 web application that each district, including juvenile and adult correction facilities and state schools, with a finding of noncompliance reflected in the FFY2019 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 2019

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

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved

100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- 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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target ≥	38.00%	41.00%	45.00%	48.65%	48.65%
A	48.60%	Data	28.25%	42.67%	32.32%	29.78%	35.40%
B	2009	Target ≥	63.20%	65.60%	69.60%	72.65%	72.65%
B	72.60%	Data	54.25%	62.21%	56.10%	59.25%	60.72%
C	2009	Target ≥	76.59%	79.09%	81.09%	83.30%	83.30%
C	83.20%	Data	67.75%	72.96%	75.00%	75.55%	73.39%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	38.00%	41.00%	45.00%	48.65%	48.65%	48.65%
Target B ≥	63.20%	65.60%	69.60%	72.65%	72.65%	72.65%
Target C ≥	76.59%	79.09%	81.09%	83.30%	83.30%	83.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the:

(1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,091
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	397
Response Rate	36.39%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	109
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	126
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)	8
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	34

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	109	397	35.40%	38.00%	27.46%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	235	397	60.72%	63.20%	59.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training	277	397	73.39%	76.59%	69.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	An examination of state-level data for this indicator suggests the slippage may be attributed to the COVID-19 interruption, which affected plans to attend higher education. Nearly 35% discontinued their education, plan to go in the future, plan to return after earning enough money to go; working full time, or doing something else first.
B	An examination of state-level data for this indicator suggests the slippage may be attributed to the COVID-19 interruption which may have affected participation in competitive employment opportunities.
C	An examination of state-level data for this indicator suggests the slippage may be attributed to the COVID-19 interruption, which has affected access to other postsecondary settings, possibly making it less likely students are participating. It also affected employment, as nearly 9% of exiters reported being laid off from a job as a result of COVID-19 and 195 reported a reduction in work hours.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	35.54%	36.39%

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

Based upon stakeholder input and feedback, KSDE is taking actions that are expected to significantly increase the response rate year after year, particularly for groups such as youth who drop out that are underrepresented. In Spring 2022 KSDE will strengthen the rigor and relevance of Indicator 14 reporting data by using a respondent pool derived from a student census methodology; rather than representative sampling. As a result, the FFY 2021 APR submission will include new baseline and revised targets for consideration.

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

First, KSDE examined the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. Kansas's response rate was 36.39%, which is the highest response rate in 5 years. Second, the representativeness of the responses were examined. Analysis verified received responses came from a representative geographic student locations across a variety of small, medium and large school districts which decreases the likelihood of nonresponse bias. The percentage of exiters who dropped out and did not respond were not considered to reach a level of nonresponse bias when compared with exiters who did not. The FFY 2020 results are representative of the state as a whole based on gender, race/ethnicity and disability of youth. Finally, responses of exiters who responded early in the process compared to those who responded later in the process were evaluated based on a hypothesis that those who do not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond may be different than those who respond immediately. The analysis results showed no statistically significant differences between exiters who responded earlier and exiters who responded later. Therefore, KSDE found no significant nonresponse bias and the data is representative of a broad cross section of Kansas youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

The State used statistical significance testing of response rates to determine if one group was over- or under-represented. Note that the survey sample was such that if all disaggregated groups have the same response rate, then by definition, the disaggregated groups are representative of the population. For example, if all racial/ethnic groups had a 30% response rate, then the population of the respondents would mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. On the other hand, if one racial/ethnic group has a 30% response rate for example and another a 20% response rate, then the population of the respondents would not mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. No significant differences were found by the race/ethnicity, gender, or disability of the youth. Significant differences were found in response rates by basis of exit. Exiters who dropped out (response rate=19%) were less likely to respond than exiters who graduated with a diploma (response rate=38%) or reached maximum age eligibility (response rate=67%).

Although exiters who dropped out are less likely to respond than other exiters, Kansas is confident that the overall results are representative of the state

because there were very few significant differences in the actual responses of students who dropped out and those who did not. Furthermore, exiters from a wide range of districts from across the state responded to the survey. Thus, the results are representative of all racial/ethnic groups, all disability categories, all genders, and all exit types and reflect the population of exiters in terms of geographic distribution.

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

YES

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

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

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

The 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 exiters from the districts within each cohort.

Districts participate in the Indicator 14 data collection process every three years. This allows for each district to receive results on its parents in a timely manner and to determine how improvement activities they implement are impacting students' post-secondary activities; it also ensures the state results are representative of the state as a whole. No district has an enrollment of 50,000 or more.

A representative group of districts was chosen for each of the three survey years. In assigning districts to the survey year, districts were stratified by school district size, race/ethnicity rates, free/reduced lunch, special education disability categories, and geographic areas. In addition to statistical information and geography, the degree to which the districts might differ in a systematic, non-statistical way that potentially could impact student post-secondary outcomes was considered. Districts were then randomly assigned to one of the three survey years or cohorts.

For each district in their respective cohort year, all students with disabilities who either graduated, dropped-out, or aged-out the year before are called and asked about their education, training, and employment experiences.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

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

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, the State was required to submit its sampling plan to OSEP and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan. The State provided information about its process for sampling in its narrative; however, the State did not submit its sampling plan, as required.

14 - Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must submit its sampling plan and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	35.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00% - 40.00%	37.00%-40.00%
Data	60.00%	75.00%	55.56%	50.00%	37.50%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	37.00%	40.00%	37.00%	40.00%	37.00%	40.00%	37.00%	40.00%	37.00%	40.00%	37.00%	40.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	37.50%	37.00%	40.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. 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 this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. 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 = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	2
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families

Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	75.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00% - 80.00%	70.00% - 80.00%	77.00% - 80.00%	77.00%-80.00%
Data	70.00%	87.50%	76.19%	90.91%	87.50%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	77.00%	80.00%	77.00%	80.00%	77.00%	80.00%	77.00%	80.00%	77.00%	80.00%	77.00%	80.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	2	87.50%	77.00%	80.00%	50.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

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

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

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).

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

NO

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

YES

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

The subset of students with disabilities population is from a cohort of schools serving grades kindergarten through fifth grade in districts that have been implementing Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports and Alignment constructs since 2016.

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://ksdetasn.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/resource/upload/851/SSIP_SiMR_TOC___Logic_Model_2022.pdf

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

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The primary FFY 2020 activities, strategies, and timelines will continue. The measurement tool for the Kansas SiMR will remain the same, a curriculum-based general outcome measure; however, it is anticipated that the calculation used for the SiMR from this assessment will change. In FFY 2021, Kansas proposes moving from a grade-level benchmark reporting to a rate of improvement calculation. The rationale is an anticipated capacity to report on growth in achievement due to a new feature now offered by the assessment product FastBridge. The new rate of improvement measure will be based on the same reading skills as grade-level benchmarks and reflective of student growth as opposed to grade-level proficiency.

As identified by stakeholder groups, including the State Advisory Panel known as SEAC, an intentional focus on a rate of improvement calculation ensures students with disabilities are not falling further behind their non-disabled peers, reflecting their actual growth, even if they remain below grade level. This measurement approach upholds the spirit of IDEA by ensuring that students with disabilities are not only making progress, but also not falling further behind. In FFY 2021, it is proposed that a new cohort and a new baseline be set using the rate of improvement calculation for the SiMR. A proposed revised SiMR statement may read: Increased percentage of students with disabilities in kindergarten through fifth grade who achieve a rate of improvement in reading at or higher than the expected growth for their grade level. Based on stakeholder input regarding the two proposed changes the FFY 2020–2025 targets listed below carry forward the FFY 2019 target for FFY 2020; all targets will be updated in the future FFY 2021 SPP APR report.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	27.52%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	29.50%	29.51%	29.51%	29.51%	29.51%	29.51%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of students with disabilities in cohort districts who scored at grade-level benchmark on a spring CBM-GOM	Number of students with disabilities in cohort districts who were assessed on the spring CBM-GOM	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
128	794	0.00%	29.50%	16.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The data source is the Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM) utilized within each school. In FFY 2020, all schools in the SiMR cohort administered a CBM-GOM in reading.

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

All schools in the SiMR cohort administer a universal screening assessment three times a year (fall, winter, spring). The SiMR is calculated using data that come from the spring universal screening assessment, specifically the assessment for reading that identifies grade-level benchmark. Assessments are individually administered in the spring of each year to determine the performance level of each student, and data from students with disabilities are used for reporting for Indicator 17. Each student with a disability's score is compared to national norms for grade-level benchmarks to determine the percentage of students with disabilities who are at grade-level benchmark or higher.

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

YES

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

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. In FFY 2020, the percentage meeting the 95% accuracy criteria improved by 26.1%, from 36.1% in fall to 62.5% in spring. This amount of growth in accuracy is compatible with prior years. This data indicates that the students with disabilities are making progress in reading accuracy, but as the SiMR data indicate, many are not yet meeting the grade-level benchmarks for fluency. Note: In FFY2019 no data available due to COVID-19 pandemic.

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<https://www.ksdetas.org/resources/851>

Kansas SSIP Theory of Action, Logic Model and Evaluation Plan documents

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

NO

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

As described in the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action, Kansas SSIP Logic Model, and Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan, the Kansas SSIP addressed three coherent improvement strategies to achieve the SiMR during the FFY 2020 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. As described in the next section, the infrastructure areas addressed in FFY 2020 include data, accountability/monitoring, and professional development.

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. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers provide direct training and ongoing coaching to district leadership teams, building leadership teams, and collaborative teacher teams. These changes increased district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities. As described in the next section, the infrastructure areas addressed in FFY 2020 include data and professional development.

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 fifth grade.

During FFY 2020, the timelines for Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0, Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, and Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 were followed with minor adjustments necessary due to the ongoing impacts of COVID-19. Evaluation measures were refined and implemented as part of the Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) utilization-focused evaluation process. The principal 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 KSDE, in collaboration with stakeholder groups, developed the Kansas Education Action Plan for Navigating Next document which provided concise, prioritized guidance for school districts, aligned with the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) model. Through webinars and a community of practice, the KSDE provided monthly updates on KESA and topics specific to special education that addressed the needs of local leaders as they educated students during a pandemic.

The implementation of evidence-based practices within districts applying Kansas MTSS and Alignment principles continued despite interruptions due to COVID-19; however the implementation fidelity was negatively impacted by the rapid onset of new modes of instruction experienced by students and teachers. These practices included the provision of evidence-based core and intervention curricula, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and promoting family engagement. During FFY 2020, leadership teams from the SiMR cohort districts participated in implementation coaching to sustain the evidence-based practices of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Kansas MTSS and Alignment continued onsite coaching and expanded virtual training options. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on student learning, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment team provided open-access resources to support all districts in teaching critical standards in reading, math, and behavior and social-emotional learning. While the SiMR focused specifically on the reading achievement of students with disabilities in kindergarten through fifth grade, Kansas MTSS and Alignment holistically supported sustainable, districtwide implementation of an integrated reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional model from early childhood through graduation. By following the framework, each student, specifically students with disabilities, received the instruction and interventions necessary to improve reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes.

The evaluation of the SSIP, Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0, is comprehensive; utilization focused; and designed to support decision making at the classroom, school, district, provider, and state levels. A meta-evaluation, including stakeholder input and feedback, confirmed the evaluation measures, processes, and analyses met the needs of the decision makers at these levels and followed the theory of change and logic model through aligned short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes leading to the SiMR.

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

A detailed description of how the State evaluated outcomes and each improvement strategy is provided in the Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan, which directly aligns with the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action and the Kansas SSIP Logic Model. Four short-term metrics monitor improvements in knowledge, skills, and collaboration as measured through observation, participant report, document review, and stakeholder ratings. Four intermediate metrics monitor installation of evidence-based practices as measured through implementation fidelity measures, observation, participant report, and stakeholder feedback. Three long-term metrics monitor the sustained implementation of evidence-based practices including implementation fidelity measures and observation.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 focused on improving the infrastructure. Activities in place for sustainability include monitoring the delivery of professional development and technical assistance, facilitating communication and collaboration across all levels of stakeholders, and aligning resources across the KSDE and TASN providers. 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 239 documents indicated high levels of message alignment across the KSDE divisions, among TASN providers, and across stakeholder groups. The collective message was instrumental in systems alignment that supports districts in the implementation of a tiered framework of supports that improves reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional achievement of students, specifically students with disabilities, from early childhood through graduation. While the document review found numerous discussions of challenges associated with educating children during a pandemic, stakeholder meetings, including the Special Education Advisory Council, the TASN Leadership Team, the State Board of Education, and the Special Education Administrators' Workgroup, remained focused on the tenants of MTSS as a means to maintain implementation of evidence-based practices while being flexible in learning modalities and timelines.

Improvement Strategy 1.0 included the alignment of state policies and priorities necessary to support comprehensive school improvement through collaborative, data-based decisions. To promote shared understanding, the KSDE hosted a virtual KSDE Summer Leadership Conference. In FFY 2020, the conference had 693 registrants, including numerous stakeholder groups. A breakdown of the attendees included 37 KSDE staff members, 45 TASN providers (including 11 Kansas MTSS and Alignment staff members), 441 district personnel, 138 personnel from other educational agencies, six members of KSDE special education monitoring TA Team, four university staff members, two representatives of the Kansas Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), and 20 representatives of various other organizations. All 41 (100%) of Kansas' special education cooperatives/interlocals were represented at the FFY 2020 conference, and representatives were present for all 33 (100%) of the districts that do not use a cooperative or interlocal for special education services. Recorded conference sessions were made public, resulting in 122 resources for educational leaders focused on compliance and evidence-based practices that promote achievement for students with disabilities.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 concentrated on the implementation of evidence-based practices within LEAs. The expanded TASN system fully implemented the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project in FFY 2015. Implementation was continuously sustained and scaled up through FFY 2020. 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. In FFY 2019, this included 51 Kansas school districts encompassing 271 buildings and 105,851 students, including 16,298 students with disabilities. In FFY 2020, this intensive training and coaching was provided to 60 Kansas school districts encompassing 353 buildings and 138,081 students, including 22,080 students with disabilities.

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. Data analyses resulted in district- and building-level action planning to continually enhance and refine implementation. In FFY 2020, Kansas MTSS and Alignment staff supported 185 Kansas school districts, including providing nine statewide webinars with 1,452 registrations. The MTSS State Trainers worked intensely within 60 of these districts, providing 185 trainings, with 2,112 registrations, and 257 onsite or virtual coaching events. As a measure of knowledge and skill development, a TASN evaluator observed six of the 185 Kansas MTSS and Alignment trainings. The evaluation of the training data revealed that each of the trainings met all indicators (100%) related to knowledge and skill development according to the Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development—Version 3 (Gaumer Erickson et

al., 2020).

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 180 instructional staff in SiMR cohort districts showed collaborative teams and building leadership teams are functioning effectively. For example, 73% of respondents agreed that My collaborative team regularly shares in the responsibility of formal problem solving using data to make decisions, and 74% agreed that Building leadership team decisions are communicated to collaborative teams.

Of the 180 instructional staff in the SiMR cohort districts who reported providing Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 reading instruction on the Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2017), 90% agreed that All students, including students with disabilities and English learners, are included in core reading instruction; 73% agreed that When screening data indicate need regarding a student's reading, the student is placed in appropriate interventions; 80% agreed that I have the technology and resources that I need to teach the core and/or intervention reading curricula with fidelity; and 86% agreed that My administrators are committed to implementing tiered levels of reading supports,

Of the administrators in the SiMR cohort districts, 83% indicated that, for reading, adequate, protected core instructional time had been implemented schoolwide, and 100% indicated that the school had a process for regularly sharing data with staff.

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers provided ongoing coaching, along with observations and walk-throughs to promote implementation and verify data from other measures. Process measures included the Classroom Walkthrough Tool, the Classroom Intervention Fidelity Checklist, and inquiry cycle documentation. Together, implementation fidelity results demonstrated that, through the support of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, schools install and then improve implementation of evidence-based practices.

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

NO

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

Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 focused on evaluation of the Kansas SSIP. All the identified activities have been implemented and sustained across multiple years. Qualitative and quantitative measures included observations, document reviews, stakeholder surveys, fidelity measures, and student-progress data. Evaluation data demonstrated that stakeholders were integral to decision making, progress was monitored, and adjustments were determined based on data. The quality of the data was examined for limitations that could affect the implementation of the SSIP. To ensure that quality of the evaluation was not affected, policies and procedures of Kansas Data Quality Assurance 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.

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, 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 90% of TASN providers selected one of these two responses for the items: Build the skills of your team to collect and utilize evaluation data, Provide evaluation data in an easily interpretable manner, Support your project in using data to improve project activities, and Promote meaningful collaboration among TASN providers to build shared capacity. Results were reviewed with the KSDE TASN Leadership Team in order to determine improvements.

Data indicate that the coherent improvement strategies should be continued. During the next reporting period, the KSDE will pilot additional supports within the accreditation process that increase alignment to the Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs and the continuous improvement process. The KSDE will also leverage ESSERS and ESSERS-2 funds to mitigate learning loss by elevating evidence-based practices, including professional learning focused on the science of reading, instructional practices that promote students' intrapersonal and interpersonal competency development, and the use of curriculum-based general outcome measures that support schools in determining intervention needs and monitoring the rate of improvement and learning for each student.

During the next reporting period, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment team will continue to provide ongoing professional development and coaching to district and school leadership teams across the state. In alignment with the accreditation school-improvement process, The Kansas MTSS and Alignment team will facilitate a professional learning series called Leading for Impact with goals that include developing: (a) collective capacity among district leaders and principals so there are agreed upon processes and practices to overcome equity gaps and mitigate learning loss; (b) collective capacity of school leadership teams to guide school-improvement efforts through continuous and comprehensive inquiry cycles; (c) coherent districtwide system of supports to reduce the variance in student learning growth within and across school sites, and (d) coherent instructional framework consisting of evidence-based practices designed to maximize the impact on student learning.

These next steps for infrastructure improvement will focus on data, monitoring and accountability, and professional development. The evaluation of the Kansas SSIP will be maintained and expanded to include any new activities within each coherent improvement strategy. Measures will continue to include observations, document reviews, stakeholder surveys, fidelity measures, and student-progress data.

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

Through a structured process of districtwide improvement, district and building leadership teams analyzed data, including examining curricula, assessments, leadership, empowering culture, family engagement, reading instruction at all tiers, math instruction at all tiers, behavior and social-emotional learning instruction at all tiers, and the efficacy of building leadership teams and collaborative teams. These data address the evidence-based practices within Kansas MTSS and Alignment. 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 tenants.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The research base for each element of Kansas MTSS and Alignment is outlined at <https://www.ksdetasn.org/resources/662>. The K–12 Reading Implementation Guide, available at <https://www.ksdetasn.org/resources/2444>, describes the evidence-based process for providing tiered reading supports matched to each student's needs.

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

During FFY 2020, data from multiple evaluation measures demonstrated that educators have the knowledge and skills necessary to implement the evidence-based practices promoted through the professional learning and technical assistance provided by the Kansas MTSS and Alignment team. During the installation and implementation phases, district and building leadership teams participated in five to six full days of 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. While the SiMR focused specifically on the reading achievement of students with disabilities in kindergarten through fifth grade, Kansas MTSS and Alignment holistically supported sustainable, districtwide implementation of an integrated reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional model from early childhood through graduation. By implementing the framework, each student, specifically students with disabilities, received the instruction and interventions necessary to improve reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes. District and building leadership teams analyzed data, including examining curricula, assessments, leadership, empowering culture, reading instruction at all tiers, math instruction at all tiers, and behavior and social-emotional learning instruction at all tiers, and the efficacy of building leadership teams and collaborative teams. Further, they collected and analyzed data from key stakeholder groups, including families. 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. Implementation fidelity results demonstrated that, through the support of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, schools installed and then improved implementation of evidence-based practices. By wholistically addressing students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning needs through a research-based, decision-making process, students will engage more in learning and improve outcomes, including their reading achievement as measured by the SiMR.

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

The Kansas TASN Evaluation project, in collaboration with KSDE leadership, TASN providers, and stakeholder groups, designed and installed the multiyear Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan that outlines short- and long-term objectives aligned to the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action and Kansas SSIP Logic Model. 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 five 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.

Qualitative and quantitative measures included observations, document reviews, stakeholder surveys, fidelity measures, and student-progress data. Evaluation data demonstrated that stakeholders were integral to decision making, progress was monitored, and adjustments were determined based on data. 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 help guide them to make data-informed decisions at the student, grade, school, and district levels. Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers function as 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 (NCSI, 2018), the Kansas SSIP is in the implementation or sustainability stage within each implementation driver.

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

N/A

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

The evidence-based practices and process will be maintained during the next reporting period.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data

and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents) connected to its distribution networks; local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families connected to their distribution networks; other state agency staff and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity and stakeholders connected to their distribution networks. Kansas also held multiple live, virtual meetings and in-person meetings to walk through the information in this learning pathway with multiple stakeholder groups. These stakeholder groups include, but are not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; education advocates; Families Together staff; families of students with disabilities, hosted by Families Together; the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and a listening session at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes.

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

The KSDE used principles of Leading by Convening (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage stakeholders through each phase of the SSIP process and continues to do so on an ongoing basis. Stakeholders at the local and state levels were intentionally informed of the SSIP implementation and were 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 included were multiple internal stakeholders from the KSDE Office of the Commissioner, Division of Learning Services, and Special Education and Title Services teams. At the local level, families were engaged as key stakeholders in educational decision making. The TASN Evaluation project, in collaboration with KSDE staff, 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 to determine ease of interpretation, the accuracy of the graphical displays, and the usefulness of the data.

Four virtual TASN Quarterly Meetings were held during FFY 2020. 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 17 KSDE staff, 13 Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, 44 other TASN providers, and two members of KSDE's Technical Assistance Team. Additionally, meetings were attended by leadership from the Kansas PTI and KPIRC. 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 4.45 for the item I understand how the content/practice is intended to improve outcomes for children and youth; 4.40 for the item I will use the content or implement the practice(s) from this training; and 4.38 for the item Overall, the training was of high quality.

Kansas MTSS and Alignment project leadership shared data with the KSDE through the formal TASN meeting structures and actively participated on KSDE advisory councils and workgroups. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project received ongoing feedback from 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.

The Family Engagement Survey (Noonan et al., 2015) was 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 indicate that SiMR cohort families, including 2,787 responses in FFY 2015; 2,103 responses in FFY 2016; 2,405 responses in FFY 2017; 2,578 responses in FFY 2018; 2,240 responses in FFY 2019; and 2,529 responses in FFY 2020, continue to be engaged in decision making for their children. For example, 82% agreed that I'm provided understandable data on my child's progress, and 77% agreed that I have a good working relationship with school staff in which we solve problems together.

District and building leadership teams reviewed building- and district-level Family Engagement Survey (Noonan et al., 2015) data to identify strengths and target specific areas for improvement. Through the online data collection portal, districts launched the survey and could review results in real time, family members had the option to complete the survey in one of five languages, and easy-to-interpret data displays were auto-generated for each school and for the district overall. The composite school- and district-level reports were also generated in each language in order to promote the sharing of these data with families. 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.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Following the established process set forth by the KSDE, questions from stakeholders were addressed through the established self-correcting feedback loops. When needed, additional data were gathered and analyzed to fully answer the questions posed by stakeholder groups. A concern was posed by the chair of the Special Education Advisory Council on whether the KSDE TASN services were equally useful to large and small districts across the state. The KSDE, with support from the TASN Evaluation team, sought feedback from district administration across all LEAs in the state in order to better determine the usefulness of TASN resources and professional learning. Administrators, representing 70% of school districts and 88% of special education organizations, provided feedback. These 312 administrators were asked to rank order the type of supports they believed TASN should focus on providing. Both general and special education administrators ranked consultation/technical assistance as the top priority, followed by ongoing professional development. They also identified practices that have improved as a result of TASN professional development, with the most commonly

identified improvements in: (1) Tiered academic supports; (2) Tiered behavioral and social-emotional supports; (3) Co-teaching; (4) Data collection, root cause analysis, and/or data-based decision making; (5) Support for students with complex or challenging behaviors; and (6) Trauma-responsive practices. The data indicated that the vast majority of administrators viewed TASN services as valuable and meeting their needs.

In reflecting on the results for students, these administrators most commonly identified improvements in academic achievement; social skills; individualized, specialized instruction and support based on student needs; inclusive practices for students with disabilities; engagement in school; resilience, self-determination, and social-emotional wellbeing; and family engagement. These results showed that the professional development and technical assistance provided through the KSDE TASN is meeting the needs of LEAs. As one superintendent expressed, "TASN is a team of passionate, knowledgeable people who will help you move the needle in helping your students." A summary of all data was shared and discussed with the Special Education Advisory Council at a virtual council meeting and next steps were determined. A collaboratively identified next step included expanding the information shared about TASN to professional groups and families in order to increase awareness of resources and professional development opportunities across the state.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

N/A

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Kerry Haag

Title:

Assistant Director

Email:

khaag@ksde.org

Phone:

785 291 3098

Submitted on:

04/27/22 10:33:58 AM

ED Attachments

		
KS-B-Dispute-Resolution-2020-21.pdf	KS-2022DataRubric PartB.xlsx	ks-resultsmatrix-2022b.pdf