

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MINUTES



Details

Date November 19, 2025

Time 9:00am to 2:30 pm

Location:
Bishop Education Center

Microsoft TEAMS and In-Person

Call to Order: at 904 am

Roll Call

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

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

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

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

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

x	Hannah Miller	x	Brian Dempsey		Cary Rogers
	Trish Backman		Dr. Crista Grimwood	x	Dean Zajic
x	Joyce Broils	x	Bert Moore		Kerry Haag
x	Stacy Clark	x	Alysha Nichols		Lisa Karney
x	Maureen Tabasko	Z	Steve Backman		

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

Guests: ASL Interpreters, Eric Bammes, Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer, Tricia Waggoner, Shelby Amancio

Quorum (12) met: 17

Call to Order

Dr. Lena Kisner

Roll Call

Alysha Nichols

Approvals

Dr. Lena Kisner

Agenda Approval: November 19, 2025

Motion to approve: Dr Brooke Moore

Second: Autumn Biltz

Discussion: None

Action: Approved

Minutes Approval: September 24, 2025

Motion to approve: Lindsey Graf

Second: Rebecca Schultz

Discussion: none

Action: Approved

Welcome New Members

Bert Moore

- Kate Stewart
 - Virtual Schools
 - Director of Secondary Education in Geary County Schools
 - Geary County Schools launched a virtual school this year
- Daniel Simon
 - Local Education Official who carries out activities under McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Act
 - Manhattan, Kansas
- Jason Meyer
 - General Education Teacher in Topeka, Kansas
 - Parent of a child with a disability

Director Updates

Bert Moore

- The US Department of Labor will now be responsible for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is all of our Title programs. All of the Title programs will now be under the Department of Labor's purview
- The Office of Civil Rights and Special Education, IDEA, remains in the US Department of Education
- There are regulations and statutes that mirror the federal regulations, so if OSEP were to go away, we still have requirements in the State of Kansas that meet the needs of students with disabilities and exceptionalities
- The TriState Law Conference in Omaha, Nebraska, was not long ago. Some of you were there and it was an excellent conference. It is one of the conferences that KSDE will pay for the SEAC officers to attend
- Dr. Randy Watson, Commissioner of Education, stepped in from another meeting. Dr. Watson: Thank you for your work. It is very, very important. We look forward to the recommendations that this group will make to the State Board of Education.

SICC: State Interagency Coordinating Council

Stacy Clarke

- SICC: Kansas State Interagency Coordinating Council
 - The mission of the Kansas Coordinating Council on Early Childhood Development Services is to ensure that a comprehensive service delivery system of integrated services is available in Kansas to all children with, or at risk of, developmental delays from birth through age five and their families
- Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC)
 - Created in Kansas Statute 75-5649 for the purpose of coordinating early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families who reside within the local community
- Part C: Early Intervention Services
 - KECDs is authorized by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C and is administered by the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. KECDs provides funding to local Infant Toddler Services of Kansas Programs to assist in maintaining and implementing a statewide system of coordinated, comprehensive, multidisciplinary early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities from birth to age three and their families
- Part C
 - Office of Special Education Programs views these two programs as equal
 - Indicators and Regulations
 - Categorical aid and Medicaid funding for both
 - Important details
 - Early intervention decreases the need for future special education services

- Serve an area larger than a school district – entire counties to multiple counties
- Part C programs are open to nonprofits – not only school districts
- Kansas Part C Programs
 - 29 programs (Numbers correspond to existing programs)
 - Program 1 – Ness, Hodgeman, Gray, Meade, Clark, Ford, Comanche, Kiowa, Edwards, Pratt, Barber, Kingman, and Harper Counties
 - Program 2 – Butler County
 - Program 3 – Greeley, Hamilton, Stanton, Morton, Wichita, Kearny, Grant, Stevens, Seward, Haskell, Finney, and half of Lane Counties
 - Program 5 – Jewell, Republic, Cloud, Mitchell, Dickinson and Lincoln Counties
 - Program 7 – Douglas County
 - Program 9 – Cheyenne, Sherman, Wallace, Rawlins, Thomas, Logan, Grove, Sheridan, Decatur, Graham, Trego, and half of Lane Counties
 - Program 10 – Nemaha, Brown, Doniphan, Atchison, and Jefferson, and part of Jackson Counties
 - Program 11 – Morris, Chase, Lyon, Coffee, Greenwood, and part of Wabaunsee Counties
 - Program 12 – Geary County
 - Program 13 – Harvey County
 - Program 15 – Ellsworth, Saline, and Ottawa Counties
 - Program 16 – Johnson County
 - Program 17 – Riley County
 - Program 19 – Norton, Phillips, Smith, Rooks, Ellis, Russell, Osborne, and half of Rush Counties
 - Program 21 – Leavenworth County
 - Program 22 – Marion County
 - Program 23 – McPherson County
 - Program 26 – Osage and Franklin Counties
 - Program 28 – Potawatomie and most of Wabaunsee Counties
 - Program 29 – Part of Jackson County (Pottawatomie Band Reservation)
 - Program 30 – Elk, Cowley, and Chautauqua Counties
 - Program 31 – Reno County
 - Program 32 – Sedgwick County
 - Program 33 – Shawnee County
 - Program 34 – Woodson, Wilson, Montgomery, Labette, Neosho, Allen, Anderson, Miami, Linn, Bourbon, Crawford, and Cherokee Counties
 - Program 35 – Sumner County
 - Program 36 – Pawnee, Stafford, Rice, Barton and half of Rush Counties
 - Program 37 – Wyandotte County
 - Program 38 – Washington, Marshall, and Clay Counties
- Qualifications for Part C Services
 - NOT 2 Prong
 - Developmental delay
 - Established Risk: Diagnosed physical/mental condition
 - Informed Clinical Opinion

- Services
 - Family support services to support the child's development
 - Embedded in natural environments (mealtime, play, car, etc.)
 - Family member guide goals
 - 18 services available
- Part C Coordinators
 - Administrator of Part C Program does the following
 - Budgeting
 - Supervising staff
 - Submitting grant for funding
 - Facilitating program collaboration and vision
 - Follow all regulations related to state regulations, IDEA and FERPA
- Lead Education Agent and Lead Fiscal Agent
 - Usually the same leads
 - 7 programs with school district leads
 - KS07 Douglas County – Lawrence Public Schools USD 497
 - KS11 Flint Hills – Emporia School District USD 253
 - KS12 Geary County – Geary County USD 475
 - KS17 Riley County – Manhattan-Ogden School District USD 383
 - KS26 Franklin and Osage County – Ottawa USD 290
 - KS28 Pottawatomie-Wabaunsee County – Wamego USD 320
 - KS37 Wyandotte County – KCK Public School USD 500
 - 9 with Interlocal/Co-Op Leads
 - KS09 NKESC – NKESC #602
 - KS10 NEKS – Keystone #608
 - KS22 Marion County – Marion County SpEd Co-Op #617
 - KS13 Harvey County – Newton SpEd School Co-Op #718/ #373 Fiscal
 - KS21 Greenbush #609
 - KS30
 - KS34
 - KS23 McKids – McPherson SpEd Co-Op #715
 - 13 with nonprofit leads
- Programs with misunderstandings and issues needing support from KECDS, KITS, KSDE and/or SICC
 - KS07
 - KS12
 - KS17
 - KS28
 - KS37
 - KS13
- Issues addressed
 - Part C Coordinator role and fiscal responsibilities
 - Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: There seems to be some confusion with districts understanding what the fiscal role is related to the Part C program needing to be administered and coordinated by that coordinator and that they're responsible for working with the funding that comes in. That can be Medicaid funding for the programs, the categorical aid funding that comes in and is

available, that is distributed out of the Department of Education, but also there needs to be some autonomy in running that type of finance situation. There are some districts that seem to not understand that under the assurances and in the role of the coordinator responsibilities include being the payer of last resort in terms of funding services in Part C, which is mandated out of the regulations under IDEA. So, there's some different ways of doing things that is not the same as Part B, which has led to some confusion and issues relating to money.

- SICC requests
 - Partner to support school districts in understanding the roles and responsibilities of Part C coordinators and the fiscal regulations of Part C programs
 - Support to legislature to consider Part C when addressing special education funding
 - Joint Child Find responsibilities
 - Tricia Waggoner: I am the Part C Coordinator, and I work at the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, and I oversee the 29 infant and toddler programs in the state. One of the issues we are having along the fiscal lines is keeping Part C funding separate from other school funding. There is a rule that any funding generated by a child enrolled in Part C must stay with the Part C program in order to pay for services through Part C. So, if a school district is getting, for example, Medicaid from a child enrolled in Part C, that funding has to stay with the Part C program in order to pay for Part C services. It can't then go into the general coffers of the school district
 - Dr Lena Kisner: Just to clarify, is this something that you are seeing overall at a statewide level? Because I have a Part C program and I already know how we fund it and keep everything separate and that's not an issue for us. So, is this a widespread or targeted issue, would you say?
 - Tricia Waggoner: It is a mix. We have some places that are doing it really well and other places that are not. We have issued a large number of findings of noncompliance related to audits. The audits that we reviewed did not keep funding separate. We have areas that reported back to the state where categorical aid and Medicaid funding and other funding sources have not been kept separate and contained to this Part C program
 - Dr. Lena Kisner: Have you thought about how SEAC could better support this effort? What kind of things can we do to partner with you to get the education out to the folks who need it?
 - Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: The things that come to my mind is first of all the funding task force is working on looking at a formula just to work with the Department of Education. In understanding that Part C receives funding through that formula and wanting to make sure that it isn't lost. It got lost in the last bunch of money that went in and Part C was just level funded because that money was distributed based upon the population of the districts. So just an

awareness of that is one thing. The other thing is just working with board clerks and superintendents in understanding the difference between the C and B programs. They're both recognized as partners, but I don't know that districts always understand that. We are hearing more and more from coordinators and programs that when they ask questions, they are not given answers are told that's up to the district. So just support as we move forward and work on these things in terms of communication. And then of course sharing an awareness that these programs work together and benefit each other. The work that's done in infant-toddler of course really helps in terms of reducing services later on and getting families involved early to do preventative or reducing the need for more involved services. There's a lot of coordination between the programs but then helping some of the districts that have new superintendents and personnel that I don't think always understand this is all to work together

- Dr. Lena Kisner: Since we are talking about Part C, which is operated by KDHE, is there a role for TASN in this project to support districts at all with some of these concerns?
- Bert Moore: If it is fiscal accountability it needs to be led by Dale Brungardt and Dr. Frank Harwood. Dr. Harwood is our fiscal deputy commissioner and Dale is the school finance director. If it is a budget issue, and you're saying you're issuing findings, then they're the ones that do the training on the budget annually. They do it every summer. With all the turnover in superintendents, I can see where people might be confused as well as board clerks. I think this needs to be an agenda item that Tricia, you can reach out to Dr. Harwood, and we can assist you with that. We being Dean Zajic and myself, to make sure that this message gets out to systems that they have to keep clean accounting of Part C and Part B. I think that would be the simplest way to begin this conversation and to deal with any deficiencies. That would be what I would recommend
- Dr. Lena Kisner: I think that would be great. Other than the fiscal, are there other things that we can do support the work of the SICC?
- Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: I know this is already on everyone's radar, but the transition piece between C to B with children and families that are moving from one program to the other and just continued support in education and collaboration with the transition process. It's more than a compliance piece it is making sure that things are done by age 3 and making sure families understand the continuum of services and some of the changes
- Bert Moore: and Tricia, another thing that we could offer since this seems to be a recurring issue, is we have a monthly webinar with directors of special education and there would be an option to provide 15 minutes for KDHE to let agencies know what issues you are dealing with and how you would like to have support. Then we can work from there on either having it at one of our quarterly meetings or adding it into leadership next year so that we can hit the broader community of the entire state so everyone is collaborating
- Dr. Lena Kisner: Kathy, while I have you and Tricia here, one of the things that I would like a little more information on is what I am hearing about the requirement that Part C programs are going to have to bill private insurance and just kind of what is the plan and roll out for that. You know there are some real

implications as a fiscal agent to have the staffing set up to do some of those things, so any clarity you can provide on that would be appreciated

- o Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: This is something that Tricia will have to speak to
- o Tricia Waggoner: So, the insurance piece is a have to, not a want to. One of Part C's findings, as part of the DMS visit last September at the same time as Part B, is that we are not meeting our requirements under payer of last resort because we are not billing insurance companies. And in Part C insurance companies are to be billed for services and that is to be used to pay for Part C services prior to federal funding. We have a new database that is being built. Insurance will be able to be billed through that database. We are working through the process of what this means for our programs, and we have a lot left to learn about what it means for them. I will say that some other states have laws in place to make it easier to bill private insurance by Part C programs, but we don't have those in Kansas. This is something that we're trying to figure out. But a big step towards that will be the launch of the new database. I know that's not a whole lot of answers yet, but it is something we are working on

DMS (Differentiated Monitoring Services)

Brian Dempsey

- Brian Dempsey: As Tricia mentioned, we had a visit from OSEP, the Office of Special Education Programs, in September 2024. We are currently in a feedback loop with SEAC, with the KIAS stakeholder group which includes local special education directors and some others. We uploaded our evidence in response to the OSEP findings by October 8th and everybody remembers the government shutdown on September 30th so we have continued moving forward with our plan knowing that the government will open at some point. So, these are draft documents for them to review and provide feedback. A lot of the information and monitoring findings were based on the term LEA, Local Education Agency. OSEP feels that the LEA are stand-alone districts or your bigger districts. Then the co-ops and interlocals that have multiple districts, while we treat them as LEAs and think they meet that definition, but OSEP said no. Many of the indicators are already reported at a district level, just some things we would roll up to the interlocal level and send it out that way. Things will change a little bit as we roll up to the LEA and then the general supervision model. There were only a couple data findings, but it was around that as well as the fiscal component. The dispute resolution findings were the most and that was typical of every state that has gone through the OSEP monitoring process. The dispute resolution in every state has had the most findings. Ours were centered around our policies and procedures and just updating that, tightening up our tracking of our due process cases and that was about it. So, all of that has been updated. We've notified the field. I believe the letter went out to SEAC with the implications of our changes for the LEA, if not we will get that out. We have a cohort model here. What does that mean? Well, we have 285 school districts, historically, what we have done is that we're going to see everyone for general supervision once every three years. This was an intentional division of those districts into each of the three cohorts. Before this monitoring, we had started internally looking at our KIAS general supervision system. However, some of the feedback received was that the interlocals and co-ops may have been in every cohort or two out of the three at

least, due to what cohort all of their districts were in. For file review, it is a review of files pulled so we have 10, 15, or 20 files pulled depending on the size of your district. 10 for the smallest districts. So imagine Wichita is a large, stand-alone district and they are in one cohort, so they are monitored once every three years and only have 20 files pulled. The effect for the interlocals and co-ops is that when they are spread over three years, they have to pull 100 to 125 files and it's just not very proportional. Our intention is to keep monitoring at the district level, but we can roll-up findings to the LEA level report in that way and make findings like that. Originally the monitoring was set up for every six years and we brought it down to every three years and now we are okay with it being set back up at every six years depending on how your system is set up. What we are proposing is to do a risk assessment. We have identified areas that we've looked at and captured everything that we look at so you can see a proposed score. In theory, if you're a district that has a high risk count we are going to come see you early in this process. What our proposal is, we do a five-year cohort, so squeeze all the LEAs and districts over five years and use the sixth year for a couple of reasons, one is continuous improvement. That would be the year to evaluate the data we've gotten from all the districts and analyze it. What are we seeing, what do we need to do from a monitoring standpoint to improve student outcomes and help districts, what is working, what is not working, how can we do better? And then that sixth year would also be for chronic districts as well. Another area of focus we wanted to capture is outcomes. If we are trying to improve outcomes, we wanted to really emphasize the outcome. All the APR outcomes are outlined in this spreadsheet with the risk assessment. When we go through the APR we have LOD, levels of determination, at the bottom. We do this every year for every district and it includes the compliance indicators. Please, just think about this as we will bring this back in January. If you have any feedback you can send directly to me (brian.dempsey@ksde.gov)

Music Education

Dr. Marvin Miller

- Presented by Dr. Marvin Miller
- Elementary Music Teacher Self-Efficacy in the Inclusion Classroom
 - Dr. Patti Simmons
 - selbies@aol.com
 - Abstract: Music teacher descriptions about their needs, and perspectives of the inclusion classroom, revealed poor student outcomes when teacher self-efficacy was low. When teachers are not informed, prepared and supported in the music inclusion classroom, the inclusion student will not be effectively taught music in our schools. The result of this study provides an opportunity for school districts, special education departments, principals, music departments and the department of education to change how music teachers are supported with inclusion in the elementary music classroom, creating a better outcome for inclusion students and the elementary music teacher
- Teaching in the traditional classroom today includes inclusion in some form for most teachers. Holmquist and Lelinqe (2020) suggest that due to the social emotional needs of students, all teachers should consider their classrooms an inclusive learning

environment. Self-efficacy of inclusion teachers in regular education classrooms is well represented in research. Teachers share feelings of inadequacy in teaching inclusion special education classrooms (Kuronja et al., 2019). Ní Bhroin et al. (2020) found teacher concerns with lack of collaboration time with other inclusion colleagues, professional development, and teaching strategies with appropriate content knowledge. Magumise and Sefotho (2020) discovered teachers felt their knowledge and skills about inclusion were inadequate, and there was a shortage of resources. Overall, current research showed inclusion teachers share feelings of inadequacy, lack of collaboration, need for professional development specific for inclusive education and behavior management strategies. While there is not a great deal of research discussing music education and music teacher self-efficacy, many of the same conclusions should be considered. Elementary music teachers should be considered classroom teachers; therefore, the research can apply in many ways. However, there are differences in available collaboration, professional development, and behavior management techniques that can change teacher self-efficacy. Potter (2021) explained many differences specific to elementary general music classroom teachers compared to a regular education teacher including added noise level with music and instruments, added movement with dance and instruments, added stimuli in general such as listening, moving, group performance, choreography, etc. In addition, specials teachers (including music and physical education) are often responsible for teaching the whole school population and carry a high student load (Potter, 2021; Saloviita, 2020; Tristani et al., 2021)

- The inclusive environment is now becoming an expectation of all general education teachers, meaning all teachers will now have some special educational needs students in their classrooms in the form of inclusion (Holmquist & Lelinque, 2020). The conclusion can then be drawn that elementary music teachers will be responsible for classroom management, lesson differentiation, student behaviors, and all student diversities for all students in the building. The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore how elementary music teachers describe the influence of collaboration, classroom management techniques, and professional development on teacher self-efficacy with inclusion classes in the state of Kansas. The theoretical foundation for this study was Bandura's Theory of Self-Efficacy. Data was collected using researcher-designed instruments in semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Teachers described their personal experiences, and specific self-efficacy challenges they perceived in the inclusion music classroom. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data with an inductive approach where codes and themes were derived from the content of the data. The overall conclusion of this study was that elementary music teachers felt unsupported with inclusion students and were unable to find content appropriate professional development and support, affecting their self-efficacy. The rich description of elementary music teacher perceptions and beliefs of self-efficacy with inclusion classes offers deep understanding of teacher experiences to help address lack of understanding between inclusion music teachers, administrators, parents, special educators, and districts. The information gives administrators, school districts and state officials needed data to offer specific needs of elementary music teachers to better their self-efficacy with inclusion classrooms and better address the needs of all students and their educational outcomes
- This study found when teachers described negative or no collaboration, low self-efficacy in the classroom was reported. Positive collaboration with colleagues resulted in higher

self-efficacy in the inclusion classroom. Collaboration from leadership was found to support self-efficacy in the music inclusion classroom. However, many teachers reported not feeling supported by administration. Teachers felt without administrative collaborative support; self-efficacy was low in the classroom. Time to collaborate with the special education leadership was specifically mentioned by music teachers as necessary for positive self-efficacy for the music inclusion teacher. Teachers stated collaboration with special education teachers was an important piece in the inclusion puzzle for the music teacher. Teachers felt they needed time with colleagues, experts, special educators, and the support of their principal to have high self-efficacy with inclusion. Information exchange and communication were also mentioned as important for elementary music teacher self-efficacy with inclusion classrooms. While this study was to discover the self-efficacy of the elementary music teacher, there was clearly an effect on the inclusion students by the lack of collaboration. Music teachers stated repeatedly that they felt unprepared due to lack of collaboration time with special education leadership and not being included in meetings pertaining to inclusion students. Teachers felt they were not given the necessary information to be successful, therefore the students were not successful in music

- *Classroom Management:*
 - Elementary music teachers reported many factors effecting teacher self-efficacy with classroom management in the inclusion classroom, including support for inclusion students, integration, and resources available for lesson adaptation
- Music teachers discussed the importance of understanding the very different classroom environment that music presents inclusion students. Teachers explained these differences without supports are often triggers for inclusion students not caused by the music teacher or the inclusion students. Music teachers stated the importance for classroom management support for the inclusion student for the music teacher to experience positive self-efficacy. Some music teachers with more experience explained the number of inclusion students in each class paired with the lack of appropriate support in the music classroom caused low self-efficacy for classroom management with inclusion. Music teachers stated more support, information, time to differentiate and plan lessons, and understanding of the music room environment would help elementary music teacher self-efficacy in the inclusion classroom. These supports would ultimately have a positive effect on student efficacy in music and educational outcomes. In addition, it was said that paraprofessional support is often not available for students in music that have support the rest of the educational day. There was great frustration shared that students were not supported in “specials” when they are the rest of the day. Music is a state mandated subject in the state of Kansas. If a student struggles in reading and math without paraprofessional support, they will need support to read music. Lack of support sets the student up for failure, as well as the teacher. Music teachers stated lack of student support caused poor outcomes for the inclusion student and the other students in the class
- Music teachers explained the lack of training, appropriate professional development for music teachers, and understanding of the inclusion population caused low self-efficacy in their teaching practice. Many music teachers expressed the lack of appropriate development offered classroom teachers compared to music teachers gave them feelings of low self-efficacy in the music inclusion classroom. Teachers said they felt unprepared and unsupported for the inclusion students in the music room. It was

stated that their self-efficacy was low due to not being treated as a professional by being given the same level of support and training as other teaching staff. Music teachers that did have more positive professional development experiences said their self-efficacy was affected positively when they collaborated with different colleagues and shared experiences and perspectives. Teachers explained how professional development gave them confidence as a professional by giving them the tools needed to teach inclusion effectively

- Elementary music teachers with inclusion described considering leaving the profession due to burn-out. Music teachers explained time outside of contract hours needed to be an effective elementary music inclusion teacher added to their low self-efficacy. The amount of time away from family and personal life had a negative effect on their self-efficacy in the inclusion classroom. Teachers stated the amount of extra time required of elementary inclusion music teachers and lack of time for collaboration with support staff had a negative effect on their self-efficacy for the inclusion classroom. Elementary music teachers described positive self-efficacy with inclusion when students found success. Teachers explained the importance of music education and how inclusion students often thrived in the music classroom with support. Low self-efficacy was reported by elementary music teachers with inclusion due to lack of support, time to collaborate, professional development specific for music content, and classroom management appropriate for the music environment. It was also stated teachers felt high self-efficacy for teaching music content and felt encouraged when inclusion students found success in the music classroom. Teachers expressed the inclusion music classroom and teacher self-efficacy could be more successful with the addition of physical support for the inclusion student in the music classroom
- Music teacher descriptions about their needs, and perspectives of the inclusion classroom revealed poor student outcomes when teacher self-efficacy was low. When teachers are not informed, prepared and supported in the inclusion classroom, the inclusion student will not be effectively taught music in our schools. The result of this study provides the information for school districts, special education departments, principals, music departments and the department of education to change how music teachers are supported with inclusion in the elementary music classroom. This study also considered what the music teacher adds to the education of the inclusion student and how the self-efficacy of the music teacher with inclusion positively or negatively affects student outcomes. Music teachers understand the power of music education for all students and stated clearly their desire to have appropriate professional development, collaboration and classroom support to offer the most appropriate music opportunities to the inclusion students. The results of this study can be used to better address the needs of the elementary music teacher with inclusion to improve self-efficacy, and ultimately student outcomes of the inclusion student
- Dr. Marvin Miller: I brought this subject before SEAC because we usually tend to focus on the core subjects and specials teachers are not typically invited to IEP meetings or even to give feedback beforehand. Some of the concepts that are present in music are not seen elsewhere in curriculum so it is important for that exposure and support. Studies show that students who enjoy music and learn music, it affects their whole day and has productive outcomes in every area of their life. If you have any questions, I can't much answer but I think it's a good discussion to have and I am happy to connect you to some of the people that wrote these articles as well

- Dr. Lena Kisner: I don't necessarily have a question but I appreciate you bringing this topic up. I think it is easy to overlook because we get so focused on the reading, math and writing, but this is a really great opportunity for some of our students with significant disabilities to be included and successful. I think we do need to continue to advocate and support those music teachers and understanding how to do that.

SPP/APR (State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report) Updates

Brian Dempsey

- SPP/APR Indicators
 - Indicator 1: Graduation
 - Indicator 2: Drop Out
 - Indicator 3A: Participation for Students with IEPs
 - Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
 - Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity
 - Indicator 5: Education Environments (5-year-old kindergarteners–21)
 - Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
 - Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
 - Indicator 8: Parent Involvement
 - Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
 - Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Indicator 11: Child Find
 - Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
 - Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
 - Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
 - Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
 - Indicator 16: Mediation
 - Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
 - Indicator 18: General Supervision
- Kansas Performance on the FFY 2023 SPP/APR
 - Indicator 1: Graduation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
 - Brian Dempsey: Please note that when I talk about slippage it means that we performed worse than the year before by more than 1%
 - Indicator 2: Drop Out
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 21

- Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 3A: Participation for Students with IEPS
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
- Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
- Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
- Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data upload in January
- Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 22
 - Unknown; Data finalized in January
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in January
- Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 22
 - Compliance indicator
 - Unknown; Data finalized in January
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in January
- Indicator 5: Education Environments (5-year-old kindergarteners–21)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 19
 - Met Target for 5A, 5B, and 5C

- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage for 5A, 5B, and 5C
- Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 19 for 6A and 6B, FFY 20 for 6C
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 08
 - Met Target for 7B
 - Did not meet target for 7A and 7C
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 21
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
- Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Compliance indicator
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
- Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 20
 - Compliance indicator
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; data finalized in December
- Indicator 11: Child Find
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 05
 - Compliance indicator
 - Did not meet target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 05
 - Compliance indicator
 - Did not meet target

- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
 - Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 09
 - Compliance indicator
 - Did not meet target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
 - Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 09
 - Met Target for 14A and 14C
 - Did not meet target for 14B
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Yes, there was slippage
 - Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 05
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Indicator 16: Mediation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 13
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 21
 - Did not meet target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
 - Indicator 18: General Supervision
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline year: FFY 23
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Unknown; Data finalized in December
- OSEP Required Actions: Compliance Indicators
 - Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly

implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01

- In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022

Discussion and Vote on Indicator 3B and 3D

Bert Moore

Brian Dempsey

- Brian Dempsey: This item was discussed at the last SEAC meeting and is a direct result of the state board changing the cut scores, which affected where we are on this
- Bert Moore: When the new assessment rolled out, we were required then to have a new baseline because we changed the assessment. So, we have to come up with, for one year, what our targets will be for the one year before this package expires and the new package begins when SEAC will help us to set those cut scores. In other words, do we go to a 0.1 like we talked about at the last meeting for each one of these for one year? What we have found is that when you have a new assessment, you really can't be aggressive in trying to say that we are going to have great leaps and bounds and improvement, as over time we have found that is not the case. We want to look for gradual improvement. Cary (Rogers) had given me all of the scores and we had come up with the point 0.1, so we would improve by 0.1 from the baseline year. So that is what we would then come back and vote on at this meeting. So, when we look at 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school we would have a 0.1 improvement. That is what we are asking SEAC to approve
- Dr. Brooke Moore: Please pull up the minutes from the last meeting and that conversation starts on page 8, if you can quickly review

Action

To approve cut scores as presented for 3B and 3D as presented

Motion to approve: Dr. Marvin Miller

Second: Dr. Brooke Moore

Action: Approved

KIAS (Kansas Integrated Accountability System)

Dr. Lena Kisner

Lindsey Graf

- Brian Dempsey: The Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act, IDEA, requires SEAs, State Education Agencies, which is KSDE, to monitor all LEAs, Local Education Agencies, and as we have already discussed, we do that at the district level and at the interlocal level as well. How do we monitor? It is general supervision, SPP/APR, dispute resolution,

credible allegations, and everything we do to monitor LEAs and districts. KIAS is how we do some of that. It is the Kansas Integrated Accountability System, and that is Kansas's way of monitoring general supervision for IDEA. There is also the Kansas Integrated Accountability System web applications. We monitor dispute resolution to some extent, but indicators 11 and 12, we have IDEA gifted file review which is monitoring through the cohort, and that is all through the KIAS system. So, you'll hear two things, that KIAS is our general supervision system for IDEA, and the KIAS system is our web application for some of that

- Dr. Lena Kisner: As Brian discussed earlier, they have a stakeholder group which is comprised of representatives from across the state. The Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators, we have 8 regions, and there are representatives from each region that make up the KIAS stakeholder group. They provide statewide feedback on things like the definition of the LEA, monitoring, and all the things that Brian talked about today. Lindsey (Graf) and I are also in the KIAS stakeholder group. This year, because of some of the significant changes, Brian did invite some other directors who have been part of the conversations in the past to have some additional input so it has expanded a little bit beyond the KASEA regions. Lindsey and I represent SEAC on the stakeholder group and we don't really have anything to add to what Brian has said. We just wanted everyone to be aware of what it was and that SEAC does have a voice at the table and we are happy to bring things back from there

Education Funding Task Force

Bert Moore

- Bert Moore: The Education Funding Task Force is a legislative committee that was put together to review how Kansas funds education. In 2027, we will either have to continue the current model for funding education, or we have to come up with a new model of how we will fund education. Part of that committee's process is to have voting members. There are two superintendents, state board member, Jim Porter, and then three ex officio members, which is Melissa Rooker from the Children's Cabinet and then Dr. Frank Harwood who represents KSDE fiscal and me. The three ex officio members are non-voting members, all other are voting members. We get lots of handouts and have conversations about what different states do to fund education, not just special education. They looked at high enrollment weighting, low enrollment weighting, at-risk weighting, bilingual, and special education. All the weightings have come into the conversation about will we continue those or are we going to do more of a block grant where we will have all the education money in one pot and then let the system decide how to divide it up. We have looked at census based weighting, weighting by student – which does seem to be the model that the legislators were really interested in because they think it is simpler that way. There have been several states they have gone to such as Iowa, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Mississippi. One of the questions the superintendent asked is why haven't we looked at any of those high-performing states? That is because they fund education at a much higher level than we do. According to the taskforce the idea

was not to cut costs but they want a reasonable model. One legislator wants to tie it to outcomes. That means if the outcomes do not improve then there is no additional money. The reason I wanted to speak about it is because special education funding is critical. One of the issues we still have is that we have to collect personnel data whether we do a categorical aid model of reimbursing on personnel or not, I still have to report that annually to the federal government. How many of your teachers in each of the categories of disability do you have? Because that is how we report it. It is in total amounts. How many related services folks do you have? How many non-public equivalent contracts do you have? All of this is reported. So, even if we don't fund at the personnel level, we still have to collect that data, so it is not going to relieve systems of that obligation. At the last meeting the chair was gone and the vice chair took over and when asked about what is the outcome of this committee, she said that we just file a report with the legislature. So that was very disappointing. There were no votes to be had and they didn't want to vote on it. Of course, it was a political opportunity in a year when they didn't want it to seem like they were not wanting to fund education. You need to be aware that something is going to happen, and it needs to happen this legislative session. We are going to have to be very cautious and careful about how we monitor this because just like what is happening at the federal level right now, our states do not want to take on the education impact. They are already complaining about federal dollars not flowing the 40% that was supposed to be here for SPED, which is currently at 13% and so even losing the 13% will have a dramatic effect. There is a tax committee over personal property taxes being too high in Kansas, and so they are going to try and reduce taxes. Well, when you don't have the tax funds, we know what happened between 2008 and about 2020, when we didn't have any new money and we have to provide special education services. That is not an option. It is both state and federal law. They did vote to have one more meeting and that is to hire an outside agency to come in and look at our funding system for schools. The last time they did that they recommended to have about twice the money we were getting, so maybe it won't be all bad. I will bring this back to you in January. If they do not do anything this session, there is no way we can implement it by July 1st of 2027, as any new funding model that will be successful in school districts will take time as we will have to set that up. These are open meetings that anyone can attend

Licensure

Shane Carter

- Non-traditional Routes to the Classroom
 - Limited Residency License (LRL)
 - For high incidence and low incidence
 - Must hold bachelor's degree
 - Experience requirement

- High incidence – no para experience required
 - Low incidence – one year of experience as a special education para required
- Teacher Apprentice License (TAP)
 - Only at Wichita State University
 - Bachelor's degree and no bachelor's degree options
 - Early childhood unified, birth to grade 3
 - Elementary
- RTAP Requirements in Kansas
 - Approved by Kansas Apprenticeship Council
 - Progressive wage scale - \$14/hour minimum
 - Competency Based Program
 - Competency based on the KEEP rubric
 - Semesterly evaluation and observation
 - Related Technical Instruction (RTI) – Apprentice working toward a bachelor's degree
 - Two- and four-year colleges/universities provide RTI
 - Mentoring
 - Nationally Recognized Credential (Kansas Teaching License)
- RTAP Option SY 25-26
 - No bachelor's degree
 - The current registered teacher apprenticeship program
 - Is the funding priority
 - Youth Apprenticeship Program
 - Pilot Fall 2025-Spring 2026
 - Competency based program
 - Aligns with Teaching and Learning Pathway
 - High School Juniors and Seniors
 - Minimum wage \$7.50
 - Transitions to Adult Apprenticeship Program
 - A2W funding available
 - Bachelor's degree Transition to Teaching
 - Pilot Fall 2025-Spring 2026
 - Aligns with other Grow Your Own licensing options
 - A2E funding eligible
 - Funds are available
 - Third priority
 - Next application window for Fall 2026 is open and will close June 1, 2026
 - Contact Joel Gillaspie at joel.gillaspie@ksde.gov
 - Resource website <https://www.ksde.gov/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Teacher-Licensure-TL/Registered-Teacher-Apprenticeship>
- Form 16 Accreditation Waivers
 - KESA regulations 91-31-34 Governing Body requirements
 - Specifies limitation to substitute licenses
 - Limitation for licenses
 - Standard substitute license
 - 90 days in same assignment

- Emergency substitute with a bachelor's degree
 - 45 days in same assignment
- Emergency substitute with at least 60 college credit hours and no bachelor's degree
 - 25 days in same assignment
 - No more than 75 days in a semester
- Modified emergency substitute license
 - 25 days in the same assignment
 - No more than 75 days in the same assignment
 - Not eligible for a waiver
- Out of State Licensure
 - Statute 48-3406
 - Valid out of state license
 - Experience within the last year
 - Complete application
 - Complete background check
 - Will receive an equivalent Kansas License
 - Teacher Mobility Compact
 - Bachelor's degree
 - Valid unencumbered out of state license
 - Application and fee
 - Pass background check
 - Will receive equivalent Kansas license
- Teacher Mobility Compact
 - <https://teachercompact.org/compact-map/>
 - Legislation Enacted – Compact Member
 - Oregon
 - Washington State
 - Nevada
 - Utah
 - Missouri
 - Nebraska
 - Kansas
 - Oklahoma
 - Florida
 - Kentucky
 - Pennsylvania
 - Delaware
 - Alabama
 - Enacted with material language changes
 - Mississippi
- SY 2025-2026 Reporting Requirements
 - Licensed personnel report
 - March 1, 2026
 - Spring Vacancy Report
 - Will not require an update of Fall Vacancy
 - Resources

- *Licensed Personnel*
- Mentoring program
 - Not required at this time
 - Will be an annual report
 - Submitted in spring only
- Seals of Literacy
 - Early childhood only
 - Required: 1,407
 - SOL added: 445
 - Percentage: 32%
 - Elementary Teacher (including SPED)
 - Required: 14,645
 - SOL added: 4,672
 - Percentage: 32%
 - School Specialist
 - Required: 723
 - SOL added: 220
 - Percentage: 28%
 - Administrators
 - Required: 1,461
 - SOL added: 264
 - Percentage: 18%
 - 8,092 Seals of Literacy added to licenses
 - Foundation Courses 201 completers
 - 500 LETRS completers require manual addition
- Resources
 - [Science Of Reading Licensure Requirements](#)
 - [Licensed Personnel](#)
- Boost Summit
 - When: June 29-30, 2026
 - Where: Emporia State University
 - Who: Stakeholders
 - Why: A unique space to engage with colleagues, share best practices, and explore strategies that will help build and sustain a strong educator workforce in Kansas

Assessment and Graduation Rates for Special Education Students

Julie Ewing

- Webinar on KAP Accommodations
 - State Assessment accommodations for students who are visually impaired or blind
 - December 10 from 3:00-4:00 pm
 - There is no cost you just have to register on the TASN website
 - Cary Rogers, KSDE Special Education and Title Services
 - Learning Objectives
 - To understand the available accommodations for students who are visually impaired or blind

- To understand the requirements for applying for TTS passages and graphics for students who are VI or blind
 - To understand how to access the practice tests to ensure your students know how to use the appropriate accommodations when it comes time to take the summative assessment
- 2025 ELA General Assessment Performance
 - Level 1
 - All in-person: 28.22
 - SPED students: 63.02
 - SPED VES students: 63.12
 - Level 2
 - All in-person: 27.10
 - SPED students: 20.41
 - SPED VES students: 19.33
 - Level 3
 - All in-person: 34.93
 - SPED students: 13.32
 - SPED VES students: 13.61
 - Level 1
 - All in-person: 9.74
 - SPED students: 3.25
 - SPED VES students: 3.94
- 2025 ELA General Assessment Performance – desegregated data
 - SPED VES Students
 - Level 1: 63.12
 - Level 2: 19.33
 - Level 3: 13.61
 - Level4: 3.94
 - SPED Students
 - Level 1: 63.02
 - Level 2: 20.41
 - Level 3: 13.32
 - Level4: 3.25
 - All in-person Students
 - Level 1: 28.22
 - Level 2: 27.10
 - Level 3: 34.93
 - Level 4: 9.74
- 2025 Math General Assessment Performance
 - Level 1
 - All in-person: 28.32
 - SPED students: 59.44
 - SPED VES students: 68.60
 - Level 2
 - All in-person: 32.54
 - SPED students: 25.95
 - SPED VES students: 20.00

- Level 3
 - All in-person: 28.10
 - SPED students: 10.32
 - SPED VES students: 7.80
- Level 1
 - All in-person: 11.05
 - SPED students: 4.29
 - SPED VES students: 3.60
- 2025 Math General Assessment Performance – desegregated data
 - SPED VES Students
 - Level 1: 68.60
 - Level 2: 20.00
 - Level 3: 7.80
 - Level4: 3.60
 - SPED Students
 - Level 1: 59.44
 - Level 2: 25.95
 - Level 3: 10.32
 - Level 4: 4.29
 - All in-person Students
 - Level 1: 28.32
 - Level 2: 32.54
 - Level 3: 28.10
 - Level4: 11.05
- Graduation Rates 2025
 - All students: 90.50
 - SPED students: 84.70
- Graduation Rates for Special Education Students
 - Total Sped: 84.70
 - Male: 82.80
 - Female: 87.60
- Rebecca Shultz: What information do you have as far as the impact of free and reduced lunches and the break outs of special education?
- Julie Ewing: I do not have that. We can get that. We don't normally look at the data that way but I can do that
- Dr. Marvin Miller: There is definitely a difference in the math compared to the ELA. Those are significant differences and I am really curious about that
- Julie Ewing: I am curious about that too. I was putting together virtual numbers and math versus ELA and it was striking
- Dr. Marvin Miller: This is really interesting to me and I think that disaggregating the data back to individual grade levels for this instance might be telling
- Julie Ewing: I think that is fantastic, I would do that as well

By-Laws Review

Dr. Marvin Miller

- Dr. Marvin Miller: We do not look at the bylaws very often but we did a big look at them about four or five years ago, but we have made some changes here. Most of us

probably don't bring them with us to the meetings, but if you do have them we want to look at page 8 of the packet and this is a direct result of us changing the leadership meeting that has been held in July historically. This meeting has now been moved into the last week of June and we prefer that the very first meeting of SEAC to be at that conference as it is a great opportunity for those that have never been. At that conference you get an idea of the whole scope of what special education leadership is dealing with in Kansas and it's a chance to see everything that is going on. So we really need to change our bylaws to say that the council members are appointed for – so the terms of office, halfway down page 8 – a term of three years beginning July 1st of their first year and ending June 30th of the third year. We recommend that we strike July 1st to become June 1st of their first year, and strike June 30th and make that May 31st of their third year. This does not change when we elect or appoint new members or elect new council president because the bylaws state that will be the last meeting

Action

To approve changing the SEAC year to June 1st – May 31st

Motion to approve: Autumn Biltz

Second: Jennifer King

Action: Approved

Ex-Officio Member Reports

Families Together

- Leslie Girard
 - Last year we...
 - Assisted 1,275 new families
 - Served 2,414 total families
 - Had 7,509 consultations
 - Reach 95% of Kansas counties
 - What does that look like?
 - Contact
 - Calls/Letters - 52.2%
 - Emails - 21.8%
 - In-person - 11.5%
 - Other - 1.9%
 - Virtual - 12.5%
 - Ethnicity
 - African Americans - 8.8%
 - Asian - 1.7%
 - Caucasian - 68.1%
 - Hispanic - 13.1%
 - Native American - 0.4%
 - Two or more races - 1.1%
 - Not determined/other - 6.9%

- Ages
 - Birth through age 2 – 1.5%
 - 3 to 5 – 9.8%
 - 6 to 13 – 49.4%
 - 14 to 18 – 36.3%
 - 19 to 21- 2.8%
 - 22 and over – 0.2%
- What events happened and who attended
 - 184 events
 - 1,172 family members
 - 487 professionals
- What did we assist with
 - School related
 - IEP
 - CHASE
 - Behavior
 - School Issues
 - Evaluation
 - Education Advocate
 - Family Assistance
 - Family support
 - Parents' Rights
 - Life Course
 - Self-advocacy
 - General Information
 - Family engagement
 - Community services
 - Mental health
 - Families Together information
- Top contact Content
 - 2,762 – Family Support
 - 2,092 – IEP
 - 1,326 – CHASE
 - 925 – Families Together Info
 - 811 – BIP/FBA
 - 801 – Education Advocate
 - 797 – Child in need of care
 - 768 – Family engagement
 - 713 – Parents Rights
- Education Advocate Program
 - Years: 2024-2025
 - Appointments: 699 (new – 384)
 - Cancellations: 640 (final – 391)
 - Total processed: 1,118
 - Early Childhood: 94
- Families served increased from 1,254 in 2020 to 2,414 in 2025
- Case notes grew from 2,168 to 7,509

- In 2020-2021, Families Together held 107 events and in 2024-2025, Families Together held 184 events
- In 2020, Families Together reached 82 counties in Kansas and in 2025, that was up to 100 counties
- 2025-2026 projections are approximately 9,000 individual consultations
- Highlights
 - Increased outreach in rural counties
 - New PEP grant
 - Improved tracking with NEON
 - ETM grant goes statewide
 - Youth and Young adult initiatives continue to grow
 - Organization growth
 - Kick off our 40th year as Kansas's PTI! (Parent Training Information Center)

Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators – KASEA

- Dr. Lena Kisner
 - KASEA Conference is coming in February and are in the planning process
 - Taking award nominations for Special Education Director of the Year and Special Education Provider of the Year
 - Nominations must come from a KASEA member, please feel free to contact any member

Disability Rights Center - DRC

- Mike Burgess
 - There is still a lot of work going on with the Community Support Waiver and trying to help KDADS with getting that up and running. The most recent update for that is that we are probably going to be 6 months delayed in kicking that off
 - The waiting list has gone up a little, it is now back up to 4,600. The community waiver is a big piece of getting that down and all kinds of systems and transition will work so much better and there wont be an 8-year waiting list
 - There is also a lot of work around supported decision making and that has been over at the Judicial Council right now, but should be back at the legislature. They've been reviewing a proposed bill that was from a couple sessions ago and made some really nice refinements to that and we are looking forward to bringing that back to the legislative sphere this next session

Kansas State Board of Education – KSBOE

- Melanie Haas
 - The State Board met last week and we did get a presentation on graduation rates that did include some of the information that Rebecca (Shultz) had questions on earlier. This was presented by the Commissioner at the beginning of the November meeting on Wednesday if you want to go and look at the YouTube live and watch this segment.

- High School Graduation Percentage Rates from 2016 to 2025
 - All students – increase of 4.4
 - English Language Learners – increase of 6.1
 - Free and Reduced Lunch – increase of 8.5
 - Students with Disabilities – increase of 7.3
- Brian Dempsey also came and gave a report in response to a board member request on special education in private schools if you would also like to look at that, it is very short. He really touched on the financial piece as well as Child Find and Child Account
- Regarding the search for a new Commissioner of Education, Dr. Watson did offer to stay through the end of June. The Board met yesterday in a special executive session and is going through the process on deciding if we will hire a search firm and what that will look like. Since it was part of an executive session, it is not something I can speak to at this time
 - After the executive session there was a 9-0 vote to hire a search firm
 - Then we selected a firm to do that search and it is going through procurement process to get that determined

Kansas State School for the Blind – KSSB

- Jon Harding
 - The State School for the Blind was established in 1867 so we have been here 158 years
 - We had three students compete in the Make48 Nationals which was a weekend event in Indiana which is a STEM inventor competition that is open to all students. They won the national competition and were awarded \$10,000 for their design. If there is a design challenge they have to meet that challenge by iterating and coming up with a prototype. So, one student from Blue Valley, one from Topeka and one from Derby representing Kansas very well
 - The new, accessible gym is open
 - Perimeter walking system, better lighting, new stage that is lower to the ground
 - Vision Symposium
 - Held in Wichita and geared toward vision teachers across the state. It is a one day event and we really appreciate districts and co-ops giving their vision teachers a day off to learn. It is hard to get PD that really meets their needs, so we are happy to bring everyone together. We had 175 registrants and had Lisa Karney from KSDE attend. We appreciate her presenting. Dr. Watson happened to be in Wichita and he stopped by
 - We will do it again next November
 - Advocate at the Capitol Day
 - January 15, 2025
 - Partnership with the National Federation of the Blind this year
 - Education and Inform

- Celebrate Access: Braille and Beyond
 - The signature event of the Expanded Core on the Road instructional series. This engaging event is designed for ANY Kansas student aged 3-21 with a visual impairment who would like to participate in celebrating the unique ways they access the world
 - January 29 – KSSB (Kansas City, KS)
 - February 5 – Northridge Friends Church (Wichita)
 - Both events are from 9:30a-2p
- Kansas CVI Conference
 - Hosted by the KSSD
 - Inaugural event will bring together medical professionals, educators, and families to learn, share, and build community around Cerebral Visual Impairment (CVI)
 - More details and registration available soon
 - Event will be Friday, March 27, 2026, in Wichita
- Kansans Served
 - Family Infant Toddler Services 0-3 years: 238 students
 - Field Services 3-21 years: 218 direct services + 169 indirect
 -

Kansas State School for the Deaf – KSSD

- Luanne Barron
 - We are located in Olathe and are currently celebrating our 165th year. Originally, we were located in Baldwin. We have 150 students on campus and are providing services through our outreach department across the state to 800 plus students statewide
 - We are dual accredited through two different agencies
 - KESA (KSDE)
 - Conference of Education Administrators of Schools for the Deaf Programs (CEASD). It is a national accrediting body that provides accreditation for the deaf all over the nation
 - Within this accreditation, which is a 12–18-month process, including a self-study, a survey sent to parents, students and community members and any other stakeholders. Those results were collected and we identified 12 different areas. CEASD looks at academics, instruction, assessments, funding, facilities, governance, student support services, and residential services. Once the feedback was collected we put them into different categories and had goals for each standard and then we developed what we call our self-study. This was 230 pages, that was submitted to CEASD. The coordinator there reviewed the information. We have four individuals on our campus who came to do a visit and they stayed for three days. They conducted interviews of parents, stakeholders,

and community members then at the close of that they gave the recommendation for full accreditation. Their board will vote officially in April. This accreditation will be good for five years

- We do partner with the City of Olathe for what we are calling Know Your Neighbor program. This is a way to celebrate and recognize the culture of our community and the people who live within that community and know our uniqueness. The first event brought 200 individuals and will be an annual event

Kansas National Education Association – KNEA

- Anna Bradley
 - We are in Educators Rising conference season. Educators Rising is a partnership through NEA and KNEA.
 - Mid America Nazarene
 - Approximately 300 students attended. 80 students competed. Winners will attend the state conference
 - Wichita
 - Approximately 275 students attended. 60 students competed
 - State Conference is February 4, 2026
 - Bethany College

Next Meeting Date

- January 13, 2025

Motion to adjourn; Lindsay Graf

Second: Rebecca Shultz

Meeting adjourned: at 2:17 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.