

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL **DRAFT**

MINUTES



Details

Date January 14, 2026

Time 9:00am to 3:00 pm

Location:

Docking State Office Building
915 SW Harrison ST

Topeka KS 66612

Microsoft TEAMS and In-Person

Call to Order: at 9:05_ am_

Roll Call

Members (X In person, Z on Zoom, blank absent):

x	Autumn Biltz	x	Jennifer Kucinski		Kate Stewart
x	Sydney Dringman	z	Jennifer Kurth	x	Daniel Simon
	Jennifer Florez		Dr. Jessica Lopez	x	Rebecca Shultz
	Brandon Gay	x	Dr. Marvin Miller		Dr. Sean Smith
x	Jason Meyer		Bradley Miller	x	Roxanne Zillinger
x	Lindsey Graf	x	Dr. Brooke Moore	x	Jennifer King
	Rebekah Helget		Charity Porter	x	Dr. Lena Kisner

Ex-Officio Members (x in person, z on zoom, blank absent):

	Luanne Barron		Leslie Girard		Anna Bradley
z	Mike Burgess		Melanie Haas		
	Ashley Enz	x	Jon Harding		

KSDE Staff: (x in person, z on zoom, blank absent):

	Steve Backman	x	Brian Dempsey		Cary Rogers
x	Trish Backman	z	Dr. Crista Grimwood	x	Dean Zajic
x	Joyce Broils	x	Bert Moore		Kerry Haag
x	Stacy Clarke	x	Alysha Nichols	x	Mason Vosburgh
x	Dr. Jay Scott				

Guests: ASL Interpreters, SICC members

Quorum (12) met: 13_

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

Call to Order
Dr. Lena Kisner

Roll Call
Alysha Nichols

Approvals
Dr. Lena Kisner

Agenda Approval: January 14, 2026

Motion to approve: Lindsey Graf

Second: Autumn Biltz

Discussion: Add the Action Item of approve agenda for 1/14/26. Remove Items for April agenda, it was discussed 1/13/26

Action: Approved as amended

End of Year Data Review

Mason Vosburgh

- Mason Vosburgh: For those that don't know me I am Mason Vosburgh, I am the Kansas State Department of Education special education data manager. I've been in this position exactly 30 years and six weeks today and this is my first SEAC meeting. Lena asked me to do some data analysis on special education students that are participating in virtual schools. I was able to go to the state directory and identify the virtual programs and schools across the state and did a year-by-year analysis. Looking at the schools that reported in the SPED PRO system, the special education data collection system, I looked to see how many kids were participating in the virtual programs over the years. So, we started in 2018 and had 224 special education students in the virtual programs. You'll notice between 2018 and 2025, we have a significant increase. Last year there were 1,377 special education students in virtual programs in Kansas. The numbers of these programs also increased at a similar proportionate rate. In 2018, we started with only 12 programs and then by last school year in 2025, there were 64 programs. Looking at the directory for the current school year, 2026, we've added more than six and are up to 70 different programs.
 - Looking at some statistics for Fiscal Year 2025 (school year 2024-2025)
 - 66% of virtual schools served IEP students in FY2025 (42 programs of 64 total programs)
 - 1% of students with IEPs were in pre-k/kindergarten
 - 17% of students with IEPs were in 1st through 5th grade
 - 24% of students with IEPs were in 6th through 8th grade
 - 58% of students with IEPs were in 9th through 12th grade
 - By gender
 - 58% of students with IEPs in virtual programs were male
 - 42% of students with IEPs in virtual programs were female

- Gifted students made up 6% with 91 students' total in virtual programs
- Top three disability diagnosis in virtual programs
 - ED, emotional disturbance, at 11% of IEP students
 - LD, learning disability, at 48% of IEP students
 - OH, other health, at 20% of IEP students
- Race and Ethnicity of IEP students in virtual programs
 - 66% are White
 - 14% are Hispanic
 - 9% are Black
 - 9% are Multi Racial
 - 2% are Native American
 - Less than 1% are Asian
 - Less than 1% are Pacific Islander
- English Language Learners with IEPs in virtual programs
 - Less than 1% of students are identified as ELL
 - Mason Vosburgh: When looking at students that are ELL with an IEP in brick-and-mortar schools, that percentage is 8.6% which says that this demographic is not really being served well in virtual programs.
- There are 7 big schools that account for almost 69% of all virtual IDEA students.
 - Rocket Online (USD 283) has 237 IEP students, which is 13% of their total virtual population
 - Insight School of KS (USD 230) has 197 IEP students, which is 17% of their total virtual population
 - Kansas Connections Academy (USD 218) has 139 IEP students, which is 12% of their total virtual population
 - Lawrence Virtual School (USD 497) has 107 IEP students, which is 20% of their total virtual population
 - Kansas Virtual Academy (USD 230) has 101 IEP students, which is 19% of their total virtual population
 - Education Imagine Academy (USD 259) has 86 IEP students, which is 15% of their total virtual population
 - Topeka Virtual School (USD 501) has 82 IEP students, which is 21% of their total virtual population
- Two schools that have a larger number of Gifted students
 - Lawrence Virtual (USD 497) with 22 gifted students, which is 4% of their total virtual population
 - Kansas Connections Academy (USD 218) has 16 gifted students, which is 1% of their total virtual population
- Average FTE by disability, which is the minutes of IEP services over the minutes that the program is open. The state average is less than 1% at 0.5 FTE
 - By grade
 - Pre-K/Kindergarten has 0.02 FTE
 - 1st through 5th grade has 0.03 FTE

- 6th grade through 8th grade has 0.06 FTE
 - 9th grade through 12th grade has 0.05 FTE
- By top three disability types
 - ED has 0.09 FTE
 - LD has 0.06 FTE
 - OH has 0.02 FTE
 - The ED students are getting more services than LD students but there are more LD students in virtual programs
- Service Locations, or where are the IEP students getting their services
 - 66% get services at home
 - 15% get consultation services only
 - 8% get services in a virtual classroom
 - 1% of IEP students were in virtual programs because they were suspended or expelled and not allowed on campus (OSS/EXP)
 - 10% is all other service locations
- Leaver rate of 14- to 21-year-olds (how did the student exit at the end of the school year)
 - 23% of IEP students graduated
 - 15% of IEP students returned to general education
 - 8% of IEP students dropped out
 - 1% of IEP students got their GED
 - Less than 1% of IEP students aged out
- Question from Bert Moore: My question has to do with the average amount of time FTE by disability compared to building level students and what the difference might look like for those students that are being served in a building compared to a virtual program
 - Response from Mason Vosburgh: I could disaggregate it to compare how that looks by service location

Annual Report

Bert Moore

- Dr. Lena Kisner: Bert and I will be stepping out this morning to give our annual report update to the state board
- Bert Moore: Every year I put together a report with the assistance of Joyce and that report summarizes what we accomplish compared to the OSEP requirements for the state panels. They call them panels we call them advisory councils. We start with a board page, which we normally have on all our documents, and they are updated when we have new board members or new deputy commissioners or a new commissioner of education. After this is our table of contents. Also, this will all be online after the State Board of Education accepts it this morning. The secretary's report comes after that, and this is where I talk about the highlights of the Special Education Advisory Council and the topics we discuss and actions that we take and anything that stood out like the differentiated monitoring. I mention how many meetings we have and the

outcomes achieved. The next page is the Special Education Advisory Council and here is a laundry list of how we advise the state board and what areas are included in the advisement because that is also a regulation and requirement. The next page is the Kansas State Board of Education's vision and mission as well as our SEAC goal and our SEAC beliefs. Then we have our council membership. Going across, it has the council member, when the appointment expires, who they represent, do they fulfill the majority because it is required that 51% of our members either are persons with a disability or have children between the ages of birth and 26 that have a disability, then it lists what State Board region the person lives in and works in, if they are a voting member, and their contact information. We also list the ex-officio member. What we have done through the years is added different agencies that we invite to our SEAC meetings which include the Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators, the Kansas State Board of Education, The State School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, The State School for the Blind, the Parent Training Information center which is Families Together, the Disability Rights Center, and the Kansas National Education Association. The next page discusses who our Chair, vice chair, and chair elect are. We talk about the operational standards; the meetings are listed with the dates they were held and then we have a list of council accomplishments. This is an overview document of the accomplishments. It is not all-inclusive because beginning with the page after this we provide a summary of the activities aligned to the federal SEAC requirements. For example, priority area one is "advise the State Education Agency (SEA) of unmet needs within the state in the education of children and youth with exceptionalities." Then we have several indicators under that priority. The first one is "increase awareness and understanding of provision of services from the public perspective." So anytime that we talked about an item that fit under that indicator, then it is listed and it has a data source and when it is completed. This was very critical and important during the DMS visit because one of the things you have to do is show that you have SEAC meetings that are aligned to requirements. We did not have one question about our SEAC when they came to visit. After this section there is a list of acronyms that reappear throughout the document and then my contact information if anyone has any questions.

KESA – Kansas Education Systems Accreditation

Dr. Jay Scott

- Rate your current understanding of Kansas Education System Accreditation
- Rate your current understanding of 'school improvement'
- For today
 - Overview of KESA
 - Q & A
- Kansas leads the world in the success of each student

- “In many situations, constant overload and fragmentation overwhelm moral purpose” – Michale Fullan from *“Coherence”*
- KESA Determination Areas
 - Areas
 - School improvement
 - Student outcomes
 - Compliance
 - Each accreditation area has
 - Set standards to meet
 - Measures to evaluate a school system’s performance against standards
 - Supports to assist systems in meeting the standards
- School Improvement Theory of Action
 - If we strengthen coherence across Kansas → By focusing on a few high-leverage, fundamental actions → Then our students will develop more knowledge and skills leading to greater opportunities and fewer limitations
- Kansas School Improvement Model
 - Fundamentals
 - The foundation for school improvement in Kansas schools
 - Structured Literacy
 - We provide literacy instruction in pre-K-12 aligned to the science of reading and assure teachers and admin are well-trained and knowledgeable in the elements and implementation of structured literacy
 - Standards Alignment
 - We align lessons, instruction, and materials to Kansas standards and clearly identify what students must know and be able to do. This includes interpersonal, intrapersonal, and cognitive skills in pre-K-12
 - Balanced Assessment
 - We assess students for risk and standards and use data to adjust instruction. We have a deep understanding of the purpose of each assessment and how to use the data to raise achievement
 - Quality Instruction
 - We have a culture of high expectations in our classrooms and provide each student access to grade level standards and content through high-quality instructional materials
 - Structures that reinforce lead indicators and sustain fundamentals within the system
 - Lead Indicators are actions that support implementation of the

Fundamentals

- Measures of progress are how we know the action is being implemented effectively
- Resource Allocation
 - Budget emphasis on implementing high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) and professional development aligned to state standards and structured literacy
 - Measure
 - 6-month target
 - 1 year target
- Educator Evaluation
 - Educator evaluation processes and conversations account for standards in pre-k to 12 and optimizing conditions for learning in classrooms
 - Measure
 - 6-month target
 - 1 year target
- Professional Learning
 - District professional development and mentoring plans account for the alignment of classroom practice with state standards and HQIM to optimize conditions for learning in the classroom
 - Measure
 - 6-month target
 - 1 year target
- Professional Collaboration
 - Collaboration system includes grade level and content area teachers aligning instruction with state standards and HQIM to optimize conditions for learning in classrooms
 - Measure
 - 6-month target
 - 1 year target
- Tiered System of Supports
 - Data analysis and utilization include screening for risk and performance against standards. Appropriate time is provided for core activities and interventions to meet student needs
 - Measure
 - 6-month target
 - 1 year target
- Family, Community, and Business Partnerships
 - Educators, families, and community partners collaborate to ensure students are progressing on state standards, competencies, and postsecondary readiness indicators
- Student Outcomes

- Beginning at the end of 2026-2027, each system will be evaluated against the following standards every year
 - Math state assessment scores
 - ELA state assessment scores
 - HS graduation
 - Postsecondary effectiveness
- Compliance
 - Each system, each year, will be evaluated against compliance standards in several areas, such as
 - Dyslexia
 - Licensure
 - Special Education
- KESA Evaluation Timeline
 - School year: 2024-2025
 - School improvement
 - Evaluate
 - Action Plan
 - Student outcomes
 - Report
 - Compliance
 - Evaluate
 - School year: 2025-2026
 - School Improvement
 - Evaluate
 - Action Plan
 - Implementation
 - Student Outcomes
 - Report
 - Compliance
 - Evaluate
 - School year: 2026-2027
 - School Improvement
 - Evaluate
 - Action Plan
 - Implementation
 - Student Outcomes
 - Evaluate*
 - *We will begin evaluating outcomes in the 2026-2027 school year as we are making investment in school improvement through implementation of four fundamentals. By delaying evaluation, we will be able to elevate the importance of high-leverage action
 - Compliance

- Evaluate
- KESA Roles and Responsibilities
 - Systems
 - Engage in the KESA Collaboration Process, including development and implementation of an action plan
 - KSDE
 - Coaching, supporting, and evaluating each system each year in School Improvement, Student Outcomes, and Compliance. Makes a report to the Accreditation Review Council each year
 - ARC
 - Reviews each system, each year against the KESA Standards. Makes recommendation of accreditation status to the State Board of Education
 - KSBE
 - Determines accreditation status of each system in KESA
- Q&A
 - Question from the room: My understanding is that KESA is trying to get the deaf schools and blind school and screen specialty buildings and having those put together, is that correct?
 - Answer from Dr. Jay Scott: Yes, in KESA 2.0, we grouped like systems together for the collaborative process. We call them special purpose schools and I work with those, that is the Kansas School for the Deaf, the Kansas School for the Blind, Lake Mary Center in Paola, Parson State Hospital has a school, Heartspring in Wichita, and Lawrence Gardner High School in Topeka. Those are all accredited by the state. We do the same with our suburban schools, we call them urban in Kansas. So, Wichita, KCK, Topeka, Dodge, Garden, Liberal and Geary county, we lump them all into an urban cohort so they can all work together as well. We also have a private system cohort, and then we break the rest of the state up into regions, and then we have members of our team that work to support and oversee those systems in each region.
 - Request from Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: We have had a lot of information about the secondary piece but I know you look at the lower grades and preschool as well, and you might want to speak to that a little bit we have a group here that looks at the early childhood piece.
 - Response from Dr. Jay Scott: Great question, when you look at the school improvement model, a lot of people at first glance just see ELA and math. That is what they think. It's also structured literacy, it's standards alignment and balanced assessment, and quality instruction. We try to point people back to the words at the top of the page. The infographic provided talks about all Kansas standards and that includes early childhood and it includes CTE,

social-emotional character development standards we have those in Kansas, we are the first state to have those. Leavenworth as a system, their action plan is to adopt a new curriculum, safe and civil schools, that helps get kids to school. They have a huge absenteeism problem in Leavenworth. That's the highest leverage for them. So that's not a system focused on ELA and math. Are they doing ELA and math? Yes. But they're focused on this highest leverage. So, when you look at the school improvement model, we try to say this is a PreK through 12, all standards. What's highest leverage for you? I would also say that on the other side that when people see 'structured literacy' a lot of times their automatic thought is elementary, but what does that look like in 7 through 12? If you talk to Dr. Laurie Curtis, it's very simple. It's about vocabulary. Structured literacy at the secondary level is about how you teach vocab and in a coordinated across the board way, where every teacher teaches it the same way. A science, research-backed approach to teaching vocabulary so it spans both, it is system wide elementary and secondary.

Commissioner Search Interview

Frank Henderson

- What are the strengths of the Kansas State Department of Education that the next Commissioner can build upon?
 - Comments from the SICC and SEAC members:
 - Compliant and a leader in special education
 - State department is supportive and works to issue guidance, would like to see that continue with new commissioner.
 - Our motto, the success of each child, has been Dr. Watson's vision, but it is the vision of the agency, keep that vision going. The department is a good resource for questions to get answers, responsive and supportive.
 - Department prioritizes the whole child, and so early childhood is a priority area as we talk about special education and mental health which are also priority areas to serve our kids in Kansas.
 - Dr. Watson has built personal relationships and that is a priority, and a willingness to be hands on going forward and forming relationships is important.
 - Continue Interactions started by Dr. Watson by being involved and invested in all schools, including specialized schools. (KSSB and KSSD)
 - Longevity, continue to reach out to all stakeholders.
- What are the challenges facing the Kansas State Department of Education that the next Commissioner should be aware of, or which you would like to see be addressed?
 - Comments from the SICC and SEAC members:
 - Challenges faced within the legislature including finances plus overall view of public education. A new governor is coming, new legislators, a lot

of change in next few years.

- Decline in student population statewide.
- From the field the relationships Dr. Watson has built over the past 11 years will be a challenge for the new commissioner coming in. They will need to rebuild the relationships and understand us as a system. Kansas is a special state and has specific challenges such as diverse population areas that are not found in other states.
- Personnel, both in special education and general education and the early childhood areas. Positions need to be filled with quality people. Solutions: First is Pay. Paraeducators and Teachers need to make a working wage, especially paraeducators. Look at pathways, there is a systems committee that is looking at pathways and coordination with community colleges, 4-year institutions and other apprenticeships options.
- Address technology, impacts of Artificial Intelligence (AI), need additional guidance and support from department.
- Gain an understanding of our whole system, where deficits and challenges are. Work with existing groups.
- Foster Care, issue of delivering great education to foster care students who bounce around the state every two or three weeks in different districts. Commissioner will need to get involved in those conversations.
- Retention. Make sure current teachers have the support and skills they need to be successful, so they choose not to leave the classroom. Outcomes of untrained staff is that we have increased prevalence of children with disabilities, the identification rate is increasing because general education doesn't have the support it needs to meet the students' needs without special education support by maybe them not being a true student with a disability so the commissioner needs to have an awareness that we need to take a hard look at what's happening at the tier 1, 2, and 3 levels within our schools to make sure our special education numbers stay in check because we are approaching the tipping point of a crisis as far as special education funding goes, to support the cost of special education as we are not meeting the needs of these students and parents.
- Steps to resolve:
 - Randy did Listening Tours where he began to build relationships not just in larger areas but small rural areas, understanding the challenges of our rural and small communities will be vital to a new commissioner.
 - Leaders in the department have made trips to rural areas more than just on zoom and that makes a real difference.
- What should be the immediate priorities of the new Commissioner?
 - Comments from the SICC and SEAC members:
 - New finance formula. Also work at the statutory level for special education and be able to fulfill work with the legislature and lower property taxes.
 - Collaboration

- Kansas School for the Deaf, we are going to have a new superintendent, and the state board of education is their direct board so for them the new superintendent will need some support. The existing commissioner was involved and invested in KSSD so having someone prioritize KSSD and help in this transition period.
- Declining enrollment. Homeschooled students, maybe some need to come back. Perhaps more communication with private school partners but try to get students back in the classroom. We need to operate like a business to meet our customers (students) needs by providing more virtual and other offerings.
- Assist the schools' role in the strengthening of the family network, how it impacts behavior in the classroom, how it impacts a parent's engagement with the teacher and just the different ways it can impact school success. How do we get greater family success? Make sure teachers have resources and tools to support their students and potentially extend that support out when some of those needs go outside classroom. Provide training to educators on how to assist students when they recognize those needs outside the classroom. Let them know what features are available in their area and how a family might increase the safety the family feels.
- Safety – make sure our schools provide support for educator needs physically, emotionally and psychologically for all staff. We need to change the narrative that public schools can't meet those needs. Make sure they know we not only can meet the needs but are meeting the needs in Kansas. This is a nationwide issue.
- What professional qualifications and personal attributes are you looking for in your new Commissioner?
 - Comments from SICC and SEAC members:
 - Diplomacy
 - Be geographically knowledgeable about our state. Know the urban, suburban, western, all the varieties that make our state unique geographically.
 - Should be an educator, needs to be able to speak the language of education. Also having special education experience.
 - A deep respect for the different cultures of Kansas. Distinct communities across the state. A shared history but also collective culture that involves many different backgrounds and ethnicities. Respect each community. Every school district has its own culture.
 - Communicator
 - Great interpersonal skills at building relationships
 - Continued enthusiasm in working with our institutions of higher education.
 - Visionary, willing to push change so we can continue to lead.
 - Make sure everyone knows the reason why the changes are being made so you get buy in from different individuals when you are making those changes.
- Is there anyone you can think of that might be a good fit as your new Commissioner

that we should contact? Please share or email his/her name and contact information

- Frank gave out his email address, frankhenderson@hyasearch.com.

SICC – Part C, OSEP Visit, Medical Billing, Audit Issues

SICC Membership

- SPP/APR FFY 2024 – Tricia Waggoner, MA
 - Federal Fiscal Year 2024 SPP/APR which is July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025
 - Kansas Early Childhood Developmental Services (KECDS) served 11,488 children in the reporting period
 - KECDS updated its baseline year to FFY 2021, new targets are in effect for FFY 2024
 - KECDS makes information available to the public, as required, on its website
 - <https://www.kdhe.ks.gov/677>
 - Indicator 1: Timely provision of services
 - Compliance indicator: percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1422)
 - The Kansas definition of timely receipt of services is that the services will be provided within 30 days from the parent consent to IFSP services
 - FFY 2024 Target: 100%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 100%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - Indicator 2: Services in natural environments
 - Results indicator: percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)
 - FFY 2024 Target: 95%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 99.89%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - Indicator 3: Early childhood outcomes
 - Results indicator: percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved
 - (A) positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
 - (B) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication; and
 - (C) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
 - 3A. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)
 - (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 three years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2024 Target: 64.73%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 67.48%
 - Status: Met Target

- Slippage: No Slippage
 - (A2) The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2024 Target: 55.07%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 57.00%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- 3B. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication).
 - (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 three years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2024 Target: 69.29%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 70.07%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - (B2) The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2024 Target: 53.60%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 54.66%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- 3C. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
 - (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 three years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2024 Target: 72.31%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 74.92%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - (C2) The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2024 Target: 58.22%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 58.30%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 4: Family Involvement
 - Results indicator: percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family
 - (A) know their rights;

- (B) Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- (C) Help their children develop and learn
- 4(A). Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights
 - FFY 2024 Target: 93.84%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 95.65%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- 4(B) Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs
 - FFY 2024 Target: 95.00%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 96.67%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- 4(C) Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn
 - FFY 2024 Target: 94.35%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 96.17%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Questions A 4: Having support systems
 - We are comfortable talking to family and friends about our child's needs
 - We have friends or family members who listen and care
 - We are able to talk with other families who have a child with similar needs
 - We have friends or family members we can rely on when we need help
 - I am able to take care of my own needs and do things I enjoy
- Questions B 1: Knowing your rights
 - How helpful has early intervention been in ...
 - Giving you useful information about services and supports for you and your child
 - Giving you useful information about your rights related to your child's special needs
 - Giving you useful information about who to contact when you have questions or concerns
 - Giving you useful information about available options when your child leaves the program
 - Explaining your rights in ways that are easy for you to understand
 - Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)
 - Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers' birth to one with IFSPs (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(b) and 1442)
 - Kansas consistently ranks above average in the nation on our Child Find

- indicators (Indicators 5 and 6)
 - FFY 2024 Target: 2.30%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 2.20%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)
 - Results indicator: percent of infants and toddlers, birth to three with IFSPs
 - Kansas consistently ranks above average in the nation on our Child Find indicators (Indicators 5 and 6)
 - FFY 2024 Target: 5.28%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 5.41%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 7: 45-day timeline
 - Compliance indicator: percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline
 - FFY 2024 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 99.82%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 8: Early Childhood Transition
 - Compliance indicator: the percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has
 - 8(A) developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than 9 months, prior to the toddler's third birthday
 - FFY 2024 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 100.00%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - 8(B). Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services
 - FFY 2024 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 99.72%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - 8(C). Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than 9 months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services
 - FFY 2024 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 99.85%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target

- Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions
 - Results indicator. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted)
 - This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA
- Indicator 10: Mediation
 - Results indicator. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements
 - 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 mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR
- Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan
 - Percent of Medicaid eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate positive social emotional skills within age expectations
 - FFY 2024 Target: 45.30%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 50.14%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 12: General Supervision
 - Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State lead agency's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its Early Intervention Service (EIS) Providers and EIS programs for requirements under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance
 - FFY 2024 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2024 Data: 100.00%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Opt-Out of Transition to Part B Policy draft
 - Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: the next item we have is a transition from Part C to Part B opt out policy, which is something that is kind of new and applies both to our infant toddler services and then to school districts.
 - The policy
 - 4) Parental consent for the referral to the LEA and SEA is not required and must be made unless a parent opts out of referral to Part B
 - 5) When a parent chooses to opt out of LEA and SEA notification:
 - i. Parents will be notified in writing of their option to opt out of LEA and SEA notification no later than the transition plan meeting
 - ii. The parent must opt out in writing, as outlined by the KECDs Process Manual and Companion Documents
 - iii. Personally identifiable information about the child and family will not be disclosed to the LEA
 - iv. For families receiving Part C services, parents must opt out no later than 135 days before the child turns 3

- v. For families who are referred to Part C 135 days or less before the child turns 3, the family must be offered the option to “opt-out” of notification to the LEA and SEA after eligibility for Part C has been established, see the Late Referral guidelines
- Tricia Waggoner: One of the things we’ve been doing in Part C is redoing our policy manual as it has not been updated since it was rewritten in 2015. We took the opportunity to make some changes that we have been talking about making for quite some time. This is one of those, which is an opt out policy during transition. What does that mean? Well, it means when a child is getting ready to turn three- and exit-Part C then a family can choose if they want to not have their information relayed to the local school district. Many states have opt out policies, Kansas does not. We currently have families that are opting out of transition notification, but they are doing it by withdrawing from Part C services prior to getting to that transition point. So, even though we have families option out now, we don’t know how many families we have opting out now because that’s not recorded anywhere. We are losing at least three months of services with those families in Part C because they don’t want their information relayed to the school district. So, we think that the best thing we can do for our families who feel strongly about this is to allow them to make the decision not to share the information with the school district but allow them to stay in Part C until the child turns three years old. How this would look is as transition approaches the family could say in writing they do not want the transition; it must happen 135 days before the transition. For families that are after that 135-day point, we are going to have that conversation with families when they are determined eligible for Part C and say you have an opportunity now to opt out. I don’t think there are that many kids, but it gives the families a choice. When looking at data from other states, these numbers are usually very low. It will give us better data because right now we know that families are choosing to withdraw from services but we don’t know how many, so we will have a firmer number and it will help on the Part B side because we won’t have cases where that Part B referral happened and the family doesn’t want to hear from Part B and Part B won’t have to reach out to that family and start the process of evaluation, when that’s not what the family wants.
- Dr. Lena Kisner: I have question, and maybe this is Brian Dempsey question, how will this effect the Part B Child Find obligation? The reality is in some of these communities we already know who these kids are without the referral because we know the families or it’s a small enough community. So, we would already suspect that there’s a child with a disability that is going to be three years old. If they opt out, is there anything the district would need to do related to Child Find?
 - Response from Stacy Clarke: This is something we have been talking about at KSDE, and we are working on some clear language on what does Part B need to know when this goes into effect and what are the rights of the family, what are the responsibilities of Part B, and something will be shared before this goes into effect July 1. It will have very clear language so the family can understand the rights they are giving up by saying they don’t want a referral to Part B

- Response from Brian Dempsey: I think we will have to continue the conversation. I don't think the family's giving up rights. To Lena's point, the Child Find responsibility is Part B's responsibility and the family can decline, which is how we see the opt out policy. I think we will continue working on that. But I just want to make sure everybody understands this isn't an opt out that they're giving up their rights. They still have their rights. They're choosing not to exercise them at this point. The family is saying 'I'm aware that I might be eligible, you can evaluate me, I don't want that evaluation right now.' So for SEAC and the Part B side of the question, it is what our responsibility at that time is because we don't lose our responsibility for Child Find, which is actually birth to age 21.
- Committee reports
 - Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment Committee
 - Still looking for a chair for this committee
 - Goal: Increase young children being placed in the LRE
 - Facilitate childcare providers and directors taking 'Early Intervention and Special Education Basics' – a KCCTO training that provides core concepts about early childhood special education programs. By becoming more comfortable by inviting service providers into their childcare setting this will increase the number of childcare administrators and providers forming meaningful collaborative partnerships with Early Intervention and Special Education Preschool
 - LICC Support Committee
 - Chair: Susan Bowles
 - Goal: Support LICCs to maximize their role of serving and supporting children in their communities
 - In October, the committee hosted a very successful virtual fall LICC retreat titled "Screen Time and Young Minds: What's the Real Impact and What Can We Do Instead?"
 - 280 registrations
 - Many inquiries since then for more information on the topic
 - Currently working on updating guidance page for effective LICC meetings
 - Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs) are required in Kansas regulation. The purpose is to provide advisory to the local Part C program. They often collaborate and provide resources regarding early childhood development to their communities
 - Systems and Support Committee
 - Goal: Promote the management and function of the SICC as it aligns and compliments the "All in for Kansas" strategic plan
 - Subgoal: improve the recruitment and retention of the early childhood workforce by collaborating with others
 - Pending: the work being facilitated by the Early Childhood Intervention Personnel Center (ECIPC)
 - This committee is learning about the many ways Kansans are working to recruit and retain a high-quality early childhood workforce
 - Categorical Aid Workgroup

- Goal: Maximize Transportation Reimbursement for Part C Programs
- Created a categorical aid resource sheet
- Working on a transportation categorical aid resource sheet
- Agency Updates
 - Shanna Hailey with KDADS
 - Wanted to let everyone know DC05 is fully in effect and it went into effect on January 1st
 - DC05 opens up billing codes for Medicaid to globally bill for early childhood delays
 - First training filled up in the first 36 hours
 - Looking for trainers that are clinically licensed to diagnose in mental health area and the train the trainers will start sometime in September because they have to practice for 6 months with using DC05 prior to training on it
 - YLink Youth Mental Health Advocacy Day is on February 10th and we are looking for volunteers
 - Feel free to email shanna.hailey@ks.gov
 - Tricia Waggoner
 - Our new database will go live in April and that has been a year long process
 - Rewriting our policy manual has also taken a few years and it will be reviewed by OSEP and then go online for public comment and there will be two public hearings for additional public comment and we are hoping it will go into effect July 1
 - We have a report from KU on how to better align Part C MCH and Medicaid funding in Kansas and that report should come out next month and will be provided to the SICC once complete. One of our comments from our OSEP meeting was that because Kansas Part C programs are not required to bill private insurance that we are not meeting our requirement of payer of last resort under IDEA so this is going to be added to the process, in getting to the point where systems can bill private insurance. That new database that is going live in April will have that capability. So, we have to make efforts to make billing private insurance possible in Kansas, even though it was not approved through the legislature
- SICC Adjourns

Free Lunch Assessment Data

Julie Ewing

- 2025 Math State Assessment Results by Subgroup
 - With Disability
 - Level 1 – 59.34%
 - Level 2 – 26.28%
 - Level 3 – 10.17%
 - Level 4 – 4.19%
 - Free lunch
 - Level 1 – 43.38%

- Level 2 – 34.74%
 - Level 3 – 17.88%
 - Level 4 – 3.98%
 - Reduced lunch
 - Level 1 – 30.78%
 - Level 2 – 37.33%
 - Level 3 – 24.85%
 - Level 4 – 7.02%
 - All students
 - Level 1 – 28.71%
 - Level 2 – 32.54%
 - Level 3 – 27.82%
 - Level 4 – 10.91%
- 2025 ELA State Assessment Results by Subgroup
 - With Disability
 - Level 1 – 61.77%
 - Level 2 – 20.91%
 - Level 3 – 13.97%
 - Level 4 – 3.33%
 - Free lunch
 - Level 1 – 42.32%
 - Level 2 – 28.84%
 - Level 3 – 24.95%
 - Level 4 – 3.87%
 - Reduced lunch
 - Level 1 – 31.03%
 - Level 2 – 29.98%
 - Level 3 – 32.42%
 - Level 4 – 6.56%
 - All students
 - Level 1 – 28.36%
 - Level 2 – 27.15%
 - Level 3 – 34.79%
 - Level 4 – 9.68%
- 2022 – 2025 four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate by subgroup
 - All students – 90.5%
 - Reduced lunch – 91.9%
 - Free lunch – 84.6%
 - With disability – 84.7%

SEAC Membership Changes

SEAC Membership

- Expiring SEAC Membership
 - Dr. Marvin Miller
 - Jennifer Kucinski
 - Jennifer Kurth
 - Brandon Gay

- Dr. Lena Kisner: These are the four SEAC members that have their tenure expiring at the end of this year (May 31). Please give them a round of applause
- Bert Moore: Every year we have to look at the six-year maximum in any position because you're allowed to serve two, three-year terms in the same position. But you could be selected to one of the open positions that we will list. So, I did list who they represent, Marvin represents the parent of an exceptional child aged birth through the age 26. Jennifer Kuzinski represents a state agency involved in the financing or delivery of related services to exceptional children, Jennifer Kurth is a representative of an institute of higher education that prepares special education and related services personnel, and Brandon Gay represents a state adult corrections agency. They will be with us April 22nd and serve through May 31st and so we are looking for new people to begin on June 1st, or these folks to be in a different position if they choose to apply and they meet the qualifier. We also have three individuals who can renew to a second term and that would be Lindsey Graf, Charity Porter, and Roxanne Zillinger. And then we make recommendations to go to the state board on who we want to continue and serve a second term and just like with this board meeting we go before the board and ask for the new members to be approved. Also, in April we will need to elect a new chair elect. Lindsey will step away from past chair, Lena will move to past chair, and Brooke will move to chair. Thank you all for your service.

Next Meeting Date

- April 22, 2026

Motion to adjourn; Lindsey Graf

Second: Rebecca Shultz

Meeting adjourned: at 1:38 pm

The Kansas State Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability or age in its programs and activities and provides equal access to the Boy Scouts and other designated youth groups. The following person has been designated to handle inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policies: KSDE General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, KSDE, Landon State Office Building, 900 S.W. Jackson, Suite 102, Topeka, KS 66612, (785) 296-3201.