



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

June 28, 2017

Honorable Randy Watson
Commissioner of Education
Kansas State Department of Education
900 SW Jackson Street, Suite 600
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Commissioner Watson:

I am writing to advise you of the U. S. Department of Education's (Department) 2017 determination under section 616 of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. The Department has determined that Kansas meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the *IDEA*. This determination is based on the totality of the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Your State's 2017 determination is based on the data reflected in the State's "2017 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2017: Part B" (HTDMD).

OSEP is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2017, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014, 2015, and 2016. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD and reflected in the RDA Matrix for your State.) In making Part B determinations in 2017, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments;
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2014-2015) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

You may access the results of OSEP’s review of your State’s SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the SPP/APR module using your State-specific log-on information at osep.grads360.org. When you access your State’s SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 16, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that the State is required to take. The actions that the State is required to take are in two places:

- (1) actions related to the correction of findings of noncompliance are in the “OSEP Response” section of the indicator; and
- (2) any other actions that the State is required to take are in the “Required Actions” section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the “OSEP Response” and/or “Required Actions” sections.

You will also find all of the following important documents saved as attachments to the Progress Page:

- (1) the State’s RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD document;
- (3) a spreadsheet entitled “2017 Data Rubric Part B,” which shows how OSEP calculated the State’s “Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data” score in the Compliance Matrix;
- (4) a document entitled “Dispute Resolution 2015-16,” which includes the *IDEA* section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State’s “Timely State Complaint Decisions” and “Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions” scores in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (5) a Data Display, which presents certain State-reported data in a transparent, user-friendly manner and is helpful for the public in getting a broader picture of State performance in key areas.

As noted above, the State’s 2017 determination is Meets Requirements. A State’s 2017 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State’s last three *IDEA* Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2014, 2015, and 2016), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.

States were required to submit Phase III of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 3, 2017. OSEP appreciates the State’s ongoing work on its SSIP and its efforts to improve results for students with disabilities. We have carefully reviewed your submission and will provide feedback in the upcoming weeks. Additionally, OSEP will continue to work with your State as it implements the second year of Phase III of the SSIP, which is due on April 2, 2018.

As a reminder, your State must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency’s (SEA’s) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the State’s submission of its FFY 2015 SPP/APR. In addition, your State must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State’s SPP/APR;

- (2) determine if each LEA “meets the requirements” of Part B, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part B of the *IDEA*;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, your State must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA’s website. Within the next several days, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) will be accessible to the public;
- (2) includes the State’s determination letter and SPP/APR, and all related State and OSEP attachments; and
- (3) can be accessed via a URL unique to your State, which you can use to make your SPP/APR available to the public .

We will provide you with the unique URL when it is live.

OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with your State over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,



Ruth E. Ryder
Acting Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Director of Special Education

HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

UNDER SECTION 616(D) OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT IN 2017:
PART B



INTRODUCTION

In 2017, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) is continuing to use both results and compliance data in making a determination for each State under section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). We considered the totality of the information we have about a State, including information related to the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments; the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently-administered (school year (SY) 2014-2015) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); exiting data on CWD who dropped out and CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma¹; the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR); information from monitoring and other public information, such as Department-imposed Special Conditions on the State's grant award under Part B; and other issues related to State compliance with the *IDEA*. Below is a detailed description of how the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluated States' data using the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix.

The RDA Matrix consists of:

1. a **Compliance Matrix** that includes scoring on SPP/APR Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
2. a **Results Matrix** that includes scoring on Results Elements;
3. a **Compliance Score** and a **Results Score**;
4. an **RDA Percentage** based on the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
5. the State's **Determination**.

The scoring of each of the above evaluation criteria is further explained below in the following sections:

- A. 2017 Part B Compliance Matrix and Scoring of the Compliance Matrix
- B. 2017 Part B Results Matrix and Scoring of the Results Matrix
- C. 2017 RDA Percentage and 2017 Determination

¹When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students who exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR §300.102(a)(3)(iv), "the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State's academic standards, such as a certificate or a general educational development credential (GED)."

A. THE 2017 PART B COMPLIANCE MATRIX

In making each State's 2017 determination, the Department used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following data:

1. The State's FFY 2015 data for Part B Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (including whether the State reported valid and reliable data for each indicator); and whether the State demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance it had identified in FFY 2014 under such indicators;
2. The timeliness and accuracy of data reported by the State under sections 616 and 618 of the *IDEA*;
3. The State's FFY 2015 data, reported under section 618 of the *IDEA*, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions;
4. Longstanding Noncompliance:

The Department considered:

- a. Whether the Department imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2016 *IDEA* Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination, and the number of years for which the State's Part B grant award has been subject to Special Conditions; and
- b. Whether there are any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 or earlier by either the Department or the State that the State has not yet corrected.

Scoring of the Compliance Matrix

The Compliance Matrix indicates a score of 0, 1, or 2, for each of the compliance indicators in item one above and for each of the additional factors listed in items two through four above. Using the cumulative possible number of points as the denominator, and using as the numerator the actual points the State received in its scoring under these factors, the Compliance Matrix reflects a Compliance Score, which is combined with the Results Score to calculate the State's RDA Percentage and Determination.

Scoring of the Matrix for Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13

In the attached State-specific 2017 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for each of Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13²:

- Two points, if either:
 - The State’s FFY 2015 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95%³ compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 5% compliance)⁴; or
 - The State’s FFY 2015 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 90% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 10% compliance); and the State identified one or more findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014 for the indicator, and has demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for the indicator. Such full correction is indicated in the matrix with a “Y” (for “yes”) in the “Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014” column.⁵
- One point, if the State’s FFY 2015 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect no greater than 25% compliance), and the State did not meet either of the criteria above for two points.
- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
 - The State’s FFY 2015 data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance (or, for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, reflect greater than 25% compliance); or
 - The State’s FFY 2015 data for the indicator were not valid and reliable;⁶ or
 - The State did not report FFY 2015 data for the indicator.⁷

² A notation of “N/A” (for “not applicable”) in the “Performance” column for an indicator denotes that the indicator is not applicable to that particular State. The points for that indicator are not included in the denominator for the matrix.

³ In determining whether a State has met the 95% compliance criterion for Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the Department will round up from 94.5% (but no lower) to 95%. In determining whether a State has met the 90% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round up from 89.5% (but no lower) to 90%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 75% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round up from 74.5% (but no lower) to 75%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 5% compliance criterion for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, the Department will round down from 5.49% (but no higher) to 5%. In determining whether a State has met the 10% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round down from 10.49% (but no higher) to 10%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 25% compliance criterion for these indicators, the Department will round down from 25.49% (but no higher) to 25%. The Department will also apply the rounding rules to the compliance criteria for 95% and 75% for: (1) the timeliness and accuracy of data reported by the State under sections 616 and 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the State’s FFY 2015 data, reported under section 618 of the IDEA, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions.

⁴ For Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, a very high level of compliance is generally at or below 5%.

⁵ An “N” (for “no”) in that column denotes that the State has one or more remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction. An “N/A” (for “not applicable”) in that column denotes that the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014 for the indicator.

⁶ If a State’s FFY 2015 data for any compliance indicator are not valid and reliable, the matrix so indicates in the “Performance” column, with a corresponding score of 0. The explanation of why the State’s data are not valid and reliable is contained in the OSEP Response to the State’s FFY 2015 SPP/APR in GRADS360.

⁷ If a State reported no FFY 2015 data for any compliance indicator (unless the indicator is not applicable to the State), the matrix so indicates in the “Performance” column, with a corresponding score of 0.

Scoring of the Matrix for Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data

In the attached State-specific 2017 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data⁸:

- Two points, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects less than 75% compliance.

Scoring of the Matrix for Timely State Complaint Decisions and Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions

In the attached State-specific 2017 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for timely State complaint decisions and for timely due process hearings, as reported by the State under section 618 of the *IDEA*:

- Two points, if the State's FFY 2015 data were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the State's FFY 2015 data reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the State's FFY 2015 data reflect less than 75% compliance.
- Not Applicable (N/A), if the State's data reflect less than 100% compliance, and there were fewer than ten State complaint decisions or ten due process hearing decisions.

Scoring of the Matrix for Long-Standing Noncompliance (Includes Both Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance and Special Conditions)

In the attached State-specific 2017 Part B Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Long-Standing Noncompliance component:

- Two points, if the State has:
 - No remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2013 or earlier; and
 - No Special Conditions on its FFY 2016 grant award that are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.

⁸ OSEP used the Part B Timely and Accurate Data Rubric to award points to States based on the timeliness and accuracy of their sections 616 and 618 data. A copy of the rubric is contained in the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2015 SPP/APR in GRADS360. On the first page of the rubric, entitled "Part B Timely and Accurate Data-SPP/APR Data," States are given one point for each indicator with valid and reliable data and five points for SPP/APRs that were submitted timely. The total points for valid and reliable SPP/APR data and timely submission are added together to form the APR Grand Total. On page two of the rubric, the State's section 618 data is scored based on information provided to OSEP on 618 data timeliness, completeness, edit checks, and data notes from EDFacts. The percentage of Timely and Accurately Reported Data is calculated by adding the 618 Data Grand Total to the APR Grand Total and dividing this sum by the total number of points available for the entire rubric. This percentage is inserted into the Compliance Matrix.

HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

- One point, if either or both of the following occurred:
 - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2013, FFY 2012, and/or FFY 2011, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2015 SPP/APR in GRADS360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
 - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2016 Part B grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.
- Zero points, if either or both of the following occurred:
 - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2010 or earlier, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2015 SPP/APR in GRADS360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
 - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2014, 2015, and 2016) *IDEA* Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.

B. THE 2017 PART B RESULTS MATRIX

In making each State's 2017 determination, the Department used a Results Matrix reflecting the following data:

1. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD participating in regular Statewide assessments;
2. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD participating in regular Statewide assessments;
3. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD scoring at basic⁹ or above on the NAEP;
4. The percentage of fourth-grade CWD included in NAEP testing;
5. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD scoring at basic or above on the NAEP;
6. The percentage of eighth-grade CWD included in NAEP testing;
7. The percentage of CWD exiting school by dropping out; and
8. The percentage of CWD exiting school by graduating with a regular high school diploma.

The Results Elements for participation in regular Statewide assessments and participation and performance on the NAEP are scored separately for reading and math. When combined with the exiting data, there are a total of fourteen Results Elements. The Results Elements are defined as follows:

Percentage of CWD Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments

This is the percentage of CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who took regular Statewide assessments in SY 2015-2016 with and without accommodations. The numerator for this calculation is the number of CWD participating with and without accommodations on regular Statewide assessments in SY 2015-2016, and the denominator is the number of all CWD participants and non-participants on regular and alternate Statewide assessments in SY 2015-2016, excluding medical emergencies. The calculation is done separately by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading). (Data source: EDFacts SY 2015-16; data extracted 4/17/17.)

Percentage of CWD Scoring Basic or Above on the NAEP

This is the percentage of CWD, not including students with a Section 504 plan, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who scored at or above basic on the NAEP in SY 2014-2015. (Data Source: Main NAEP Data Explorer; data extracted 4/13/16.)

Percentage of CWD Included in NAEP Testing

This is the reported percentage of identified CWD, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (math and reading), who were included in the NAEP testing in SY 2014-2015. (Data Source: Main NAEP Data Explorer, 2015):

⁹ While the goal is to ensure that all CWD demonstrate proficient or advanced mastery of challenging subject matter, we recognize that States may need to take intermediate steps to reach this benchmark. Therefore, we assessed the performance of CWD using the Basic achievement level on the NAEP, which also provided OSEP with the broader range of data needed to identify variations in student performance across States. Generally, the Basic achievement level on the NAEP means that students have demonstrated partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.

Inclusion rate for 4th and 8th grade reading (see page 6):

www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/files/2015_Tech_Appendix_Reading.pdf

Inclusion rate for 4th and 8th grade math (see page 6):

www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/files/2015_Tech_Appendix_Math.pdf

Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out

This is a calculation of the percentage of CWD, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by dropping out. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the exit reason category *dropped out* by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*), then multiplying the result by 100. (Data source: EDFacts SY 2014-15; data extracted 6/6/16)

Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma

This is a calculation of the percentage of CWD, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the exit reason category *graduated with a regular high school diploma* by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*), then multiplying the result by 100. (Data source: EDFacts SY 2014-15; data extracted 6/6/16.)

Scoring of the Results Matrix

In the attached State-specific 2017 Part B Results Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Results Elements:

- A State's participation rates on regular Statewide assessments were assigned scores of '2', '1' or '0' based on an analysis of the participation rates across all States and whether a State administered an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards (AA-MAAS).¹⁰ For a State that did not administer an AA-MAAS, a score of '2' was assigned if at least 90% of their CWD participated in the regular Statewide assessment; a score of '1' if the participation rate for CWD was 80% to 89%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate for CWD was less than 80%. For a State that administered an AA-MAAS, a score of '2' was assigned if the participation rate of CWD was 70% or

¹⁰In FFY 2015, in assessing the academic progress of students with disabilities under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), some States were permitted to develop and administer AA-MAAS for eligible students with disabilities, and to include Proficient and Advanced scores of students who took those assessments in ESEA accountability determinations, provided the number of those scores at the district and state levels, separately, did not exceed 2.0 percent of all students in the tested grades. States were also permitted to develop and administer alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, and to include Proficient and Advanced scores of students who took those assessments in ESEA accountability determinations, provided the number of those scores at the district and state levels, separately, did not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the tested grades.

HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

greater; a score of '1' if the participation rate of CWD was 60% to 69%; and a score of '0' if the participation rate of CWD was less than 60%.

- A State's NAEP scores (Basic and above) were rank-ordered; the top third of States received a '2', the middle third of States received a '1', and the bottom third of States received a '0'.
- A State's NAEP inclusion rate was assigned a score of either '0' or '1' based on whether the State's NAEP inclusion rate for CWD was "higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board [NAGB] goal of 85 percent." "Standard error estimates" were reported with the inclusion rates of CWD and taken into account in determining if a State's inclusion rate was higher than or not significantly different from the NAGB goal of 85 percent.
- A State's data on the percentage of CWD who exited school by dropping out were rank-ordered; the top third of States (*i.e.*, those with the lowest percentage) received a score of '2', the middle third of States received a '1', and the bottom third of States (*i.e.*, those with the highest percentage) received a '0'.
- A State's data on the percentage of CWD who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma were rank-ordered; the top third of States (*i.e.*, those with the highest percentage) received a score of '2', the middle third of States received a '1', and the bottom third of States (*i.e.*, those with the lowest percentage) received a '0'.

The following table identifies how each of the Results Elements was scored:

Results Elements	RDA Score= 0	RDA Score= 1	RDA Score= 2
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments (reading and math, separately)	<80	80-89	>=90
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments for States with AA-MAAS (reading and math, separately)	<60	60-69	>=70
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<=24	25-31	>=32
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<=26	27-35	>=36
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<=45	46-54	>=55
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<=23	24-28	>=29
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma	<=58	59-73	>=74
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out	>=25	24-15	<=14

Percentage of 4th and 8th Grade CWD included in NAEP testing (reading or math):

1 point if State's inclusion rate was higher than or not significantly different from the NAGB goal of 85%.

0 points if less than 85%.

HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

Using the cumulative possible number of points as the denominator, and using as the numerator the actual points the State received in its scoring under the Results Elements, the Results Matrix reflects a Results Score, which is combined with the Compliance Score to calculate the State's RDA Percentage and Determination.

C. The RDA Percentage and Determination

The State's RDA Percentage was calculated by adding 50% of the State's Results Score and 50% of the State's Compliance Score. The State's RDA Determination is defined as follows:

Meets Requirements

A State's 2017 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%,¹¹ unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2014, 2015, and 2016) *IDEA* Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.

Needs Assistance

A State's 2017 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2014, 2015, and 2016) *IDEA* Part B grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2017 determination.

Needs Intervention

A State's 2017 RDA Determination is Needs Intervention if the RDA Percentage is less than 60%.

Needs Substantial Intervention

The Department did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any State in 2017.

¹¹ In determining whether a State has met this 80% matrix criterion for a Meets Requirements determination, the Department will round up from 79.5% (but no lower) to 80%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 60% matrix criterion for a Needs Assistance determination discussed below, the Department will round up from 59.5% (but no lower) to 60%.

Part B Data Display: **KANSAS**
 Publication Year 2017

Identification of Children with Disabilities

STUDENT ENROLLMENT, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Student Category	State Students (#)	State Students (%)	Nation Students (#)	Nation Students (%)
All students	440,647		45,592,409	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,375	13.5	6,050,725	13.3

Explanatory Note: The number of total students enrolled in public schools in the state and nation as of October 1, 2014 (or the closest day to October 1) for all grade levels from grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded. The number and percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2015). Children with disabilities (IDEA) are served by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and Educational Environments and the SY 2014-15 Common Core of Data (CCD). National IDEA Child Count and Educational Environments data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and the national CCD data represent the US and Outlying Areas.

PERCENT OF POPULATION WHO ARE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA), AGES 3 THROUGH 21

Age	State (%) SY 2013-14	State (%) SY 2014-15	State (%) SY 2015-16	Nation (%) SY 2015-16
3 through 5	9.2	9.6	9.5	6.4
6 through 21	8.8	8.9	9.1	9.1

Explanatory Note: The percentage of the population who are children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state designated special education child count date, for the age ranges of 3 through 5 and 6 through 21. Data reported for IDEA Child Count and Educational Environments and Census. National IDEA Child Count and Educational Environments data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and national Census data represent the 50 states and DC (including BIE).

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	Percent of Overall Student Enrollment State (%)	Percent of Overall Student Enrollment Nation (%)
Autism	0.82	1.21
Deaf-blindness	0.00	0.00
Emotional disturbance	0.52	0.76
Hearing impairment	0.12	0.15
Intellectual disability	0.75	0.92
Multiple disabilities	0.63	0.27
Orthopedic impairment	0.05	0.09
Other health impairment	1.71	1.99
Specific learning disabilities	5.54	5.15
Speech or language impairment	1.91	2.29
Traumatic brain injury	0.03	0.06
Visual impairment	0.04	0.05

Explanatory Note: The percentage of enrollees who are children with disabilities (IDEA), by disability category, in the state and nation for the age range of 6 through 21 (excluding children reported in the category of developmental delays). For this calculation, the numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) in a specific disability category as of the state-designated special education child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2015) for ages 6 through 21 (excluding children reported in the category of developmental delays) and the denominator is the total number of students enrolled in public schools as of October 1, 2014 (or the closest school day to October 1) for all grade levels from grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded. Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and Educational Environments and SY 2014-15 CCD. National IDEA Child Count data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States and national CCD data represent US and Outlying Areas.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 3 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 Nation (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 6-21 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 6-21 Nation (%)
All disabilities	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Autism	3.7	9.5	6.7	9.3
Deaf-blindness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Developmental delay*	58.1	37.4		
Emotional disturbance	0.0	0.4	4.3	5.9
Hearing impairment	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.1
Intellectual disability	0.3	1.8	6.2	7.1
Multiple disabilities	0.7	1.0	5.2	2.1
Orthopedic impairment	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.7
Other health impairment	1.0	3.1	14.1	15.4
Specific learning disabilities	0.2	1.1	45.6	39.8
Speech or language impairment	34.8	43.3	15.8	17.7
Traumatic brain injury	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4
Visual impairment	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4

*Developmental delay is only allowable through age 9, so a 6-21 percentage cannot be calculated.

Explanatory Note: The percentage represents a distribution of children with disabilities (IDEA) by disability category for age ranges 3 through 5 and 6 through 21 (excluding children reported in the category of developmental delays). For this calculation, the denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA) for the specified age range, excluding developmental delays for ages 6 through 21. Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and Educational Environments. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

Graduation

FOUR-YEAR REGULATORY ADJUSTED COHORT GRADUATION RATE

	CWDs (IDEA) (%)	All Students (%)
SY 2014-15	77.30%	85.70%

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students from the original cohort who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma. Data reported for Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) purposes.

EXITING SPECIAL EDUCATION AND SCHOOL, AGES 14 THROUGH 21

Method of Exiting:	Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma (%)	Received a Certificate (%)	Dropped Out (%)	Reached Maximum Age (%)
SY 2014-15	81.3	-	16.7	1.6

Explanatory Note: The percentages were calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA*, Part B, reported in the exit reason category (i.e., *graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, or reached maximum age*) for the year by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA*, Part B, reported in the five categories that represent exiting from special education and school (i.e., *graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*) for that year, then multiplying the result by 100. The U.S. Department of Education collects data on seven categories of exiters from special education (i.e., the Part B program in which the student was enrolled at the start of the reporting period). The categories include five categories of exiters from both special education and school (i.e., *graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*) and two categories of exiters from special education, but not school (i.e., *transferred to regular education and moved, known to be continuing in education*). The seven categories are mutually exclusive. Students with disabilities reported in the Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma category represent students who exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR 300.102(a)(3)(iv), “the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards, such as a certificate or GED.” The percentages of students who exited special education and school by graduating as required under *IDEA* and included in this report are not comparable to the graduation rates required for reporting in CSPR. The data used to calculate percentages of students who exited special education and school by graduating or dropping out are different from those used to calculate other graduation and dropout rates. In particular, states often use data such as the number of students who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma and the number of students who entered high school four years earlier to determine their graduation rates for the CSPR. These exiting data are from the reporting period between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015. Data reported for IDEA 2014-15 Exiting.

Educational Environment

EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS, AGES 3 THROUGH 5

Disability Category	CWDs Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program State (%)	CWDs Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program Nation (%)	CWDs Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility State (%)	CWDs Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility Nation (%)
All disabilities	37.2	44.8	33.5	25.2
Autism	43.3	35.9	37.9	46.0
Deaf-blindness	66.7	40.5	0.0	43.6
Developmental delay	50.6	45.7	32.4	34.5
Emotional disturbance	33.3	47.8	0.0	19.8
Hearing impairment	40.0	39.5	38.7	40.1
Intellectual disability	34.5	33.4	48.3	41.6
Multiple disabilities	38.1	26.3	29.8	47.7
Orthopedic impairment	42.1	47.4	28.9	31.0
Other health impairment	32.8	47.7	38.7	28.1
Specific learning disabilities	95.2	50.6	0.0	11.3
Speech or language impairment	13.9	46.6	34.9	11.0
Traumatic brain injury	28.6	41.4	57.1	34.6
Visual impairment	44.4	50.9	33.3	27.9

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category attending and receiving the majority of special education and related services in a regular early childhood program, or a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility. Note that this table does not include all reported preschool educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5, in a specified disability category. Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and Educational Environments. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS, AGES 6 THROUGH 21
 Percent of Time Spent Inside the Regular Classroom

Disability Category	≥ 80% of Day State (%)	≥ 80% of Day Nation (%)	40 to 79% of Day State (%)	40 to 79% of Day Nation (%)	< 40% of Day State (%)	< 40% of Day Nation (%)	Separate School or Residential Facility State (%)	Separate School or Residential Facility Nation (%)
All disabilities	68.1	62.7	20.9	18.7	7.3	13.4	2.2	3.2
Autism	44.8	39.6	25.9	18.1	24.6	33.2	4.1	7.5
Deaf-blindness	13.3	23.8	13.3	11.6	46.7	36.0	26.7	25.2
Emotional disturbance	49.6	47.1	19.9	17.4	13.4	18.5	14.9	14.3
Hearing impairment	61.3	61.1	18.0	15.8	5.5	11.6	13.9	9.6
Intellectual disability	12.5	16.5	45.6	26.3	37.3	49.7	4.1	6.4
Multiple disabilities	34.8	13.3	28.2	16.5	25.8	46.2	8.4	19.7
Orthopedic impairment	69.9	53.6	17.4	15.6	8.7	22.8	2.7	4.3
Other health impairment	67.5	65.6	23.7	21.1	5.2	9.0	2.2	1.9
Specific learning disabilities	75.5	69.7	22.2	22.9	1.0	5.5	0.2	0.5
Speech or language impairment	95.9	86.6	0.9	5.3	0.2	4.2	0.0	0.3
Traumatic brain injury	44.5	50.1	35.0	21.9	16.8	20.0	2.9	5.4
Visual impairment	66.7	67.2	20.5	12.7	4.6	9.8	5.1	8.1

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category (excluding children with developmental delays) attending regular classrooms, or separate schools and residential facilities. Note that this table does not include all reported educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21 (excluding children with developmental delays), in a specified disability category. Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and Educational Environments. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States.

Participation and Performance on Assessments

PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) IN STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	General Assessment (%)	Alternate Assessment (%)	Non-participant (%)
4th grade reading/language arts	90	8	2
8th grade reading/language arts	89	8	3
High school reading/language arts	87	9	4
4th grade mathematics	90	8	2
8th grade mathematics	89	8	3
High school mathematics	87	9	4

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in statewide assessments for reading and mathematics for 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school. The denominator is the sum of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated and children with disabilities (IDEA) who did not participate in statewide assessments (excluding those with a significant medical emergency who did not take the assessment). Due to differences in the calculations used for the “children with disabilities (IDEA)” subgroup, these percentages may differ from those reported for the CSPR. Data reported for 2015-16 Assessment, accessed from EDFacts on April 12, 2017.

Participation data submitted by the following states/ entities were flagged due to questionable data quality in one or more subject areas, grades, and assessment types: AS, BIE, WV.

PERFORMANCE ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	Proficient (%) General Assessment (CWD)	Proficient (%) Alternate Assessment (CWD)	Proficient (%) General Assessment (All Students)
4th grade reading/language arts	22	54	53
8th grade reading/language arts	5	37	31
High school reading/language arts	6	34	32
4th grade mathematics	15	26	37
8th grade mathematics	5	17	26
High school mathematics	3	16	24

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students in the state who scored at or above proficient (as determined by each state) on the general assessment for all students and children with disabilities (IDEA) in 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school, and the percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state who scored at or above proficient (as determined by each state) on the alternate assessment.

Due to differences in the calculations used for the “all students” and “children with disabilities (IDEA)” subgroup, these percentages may differ from those reported for the CSPR. Data reported for 2015-16 Assessment, accessed from ED Facts on April 12, 2017.

Achievement data submitted by the following states/ entities were flagged due to questionable data quality in one or more subject areas, grades, and assessment types: AS, BIE, IL, WV.

PERFORMANCE ON 2015 NAEP ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	At or Above (%) Basic (CWD)	At or Above (%) Basic (Non-CWD)	At or Above (%) Proficient (CWD)	At or Above (%) Proficient (Non- CWD)
4th grade reading/language arts	22	74	7	40
8th grade reading/language arts	36	84	7	38
4th grade mathematics	54	88	20	45
8th grade mathematics	27	82	5	37

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students in the state who scored at or above the Basic level and at or above the Proficient level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for children with disabilities (IDEA) and children without disabilities. Since the NAEP is administered every other year, the percentages reported in this table will remain consistent for a two-year period of time. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires states that receive Title I funding to participate in the state NAEP in reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 every two years. State NAEP does not provide individual scores for the students or schools assessed. Instead, NAEP provides results about subject-matter achievement, instructional experiences, and school environment, and reports these results for populations of students (e.g., fourth-graders) and subgroups of those populations (e.g., children with disabilities (IDEA)).

INCLUSION RATES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES ON 2015 NAEP ASSESSMENTS

Grade and Subject Assessed	Inclusion Rate State (%)	Inclusion Rate Nation (%)
4th grade reading/language arts	89	87
8th grade reading/language arts	92	87
4th grade mathematics	93	89
8th grade mathematics	92	90

Explanatory Note: The percentage of students identified as having a disability who were included in the NAEP assessment. A state's inclusion rate of students identified as having a disability is the weighted percentage of students identified as having a disability in the state sampled by NAEP who participate in NAEP. In other words, the weighted number of students identified as having a disability in a state who are selected for participation in NAEP is in the denominator, the weighted number of those students who participate in NAEP is in the numerator, and the fraction is multiplied by 100 to turn it into a percentage.
 National inclusion rates were based on figures available under "National (public)." Since the NAEP is administered every other year, the percentages reported in this table will remain consistent for a two-year period of time.

Race/Ethnicity

PERCENT OF STATE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Disability Category	Hispanic/ Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/ Ethnicities (%)
All students	18.6	7.1	65.6	2.7	1.0	0.2	4.8	100.0
All disabilities	17.2	9.2	65.3	1.4	1.3	0.1	5.5	100.0
Autism	12.4	8.7	69.4	2.8	0.8	0.1	5.8	100.0
Deaf-blindness	26.7	0.0	60.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Emotional disturbance	10.2	13.6	65.7	0.5	1.2	0.1	8.7	100.0
Hearing impairment	17.9	7.7	64.3	4.5	0.8	0.0	4.9	100.0
Intellectual disability	18.4	15.1	57.8	1.7	1.3	0.1	5.6	100.0
Multiple disabilities	12.0	8.9	70.4	1.4	1.3	0.2	5.8	100.0
Orthopedic impairment	16.9	4.1	69.9	4.1	1.4	0.5	3.2	100.0
Other health impairment	10.0	8.5	73.4	0.8	1.0	0.1	6.1	100.0
Specific learning disabilities	21.7	10.6	60.0	1.0	1.6	0.1	5.0	100.0
Speech or language impairment	15.6	4.7	71.5	2.1	0.9	0.1	5.1	100.0
Traumatic brain injury	16.8	10.9	59.1	2.9	2.9	0.0	7.3	100.0
Visual impairment	15.9	7.7	60.0	7.2	3.1	1.0	5.1	100.0

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category and particular race/ethnicity category in the state. The numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category and race/ethnicity category as of the state designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2015) and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular disability category. The "All Student" row is calculated using the total number of students enrolled in public schools in grade 1 through grade 12, as well as ungraded, in the state as of October 1, 2014 (or the closest day to October 1). Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and SY 2014-15 CCD.

PERCENT OF STATE CWDS (IDEA) BY EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 6 THROUGH 21

Educational Environment	Hispanic/Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/Ethnicities (%)
≥ 80% of day spent inside regular classroom	69.6	63.3	69.7	63.5	67.8	68.0	68.4	68.9
40 to 79% of day spent inside regular classroom	20.6	24.0	20.1	19.7	21.8	26.7	20.9	20.6
< 40% of day spent inside regular classroom	7.1	8.6	6.5	12.1	7.4	2.7	7.8	7.0
Separate school; Residential facility	1.1	2.9	2.1	2.8	2.3	2.7	2.1	2.1

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category and particular educational environment in the state. The numerator is the number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category and particular educational environment as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2015) and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 6 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category. Data reported for IDEA 2015 Child Count and Educational Environments.

TOTAL DISCIPLINARY REMOVALS OF CWD (IDEA) IN STATE BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGES 3 THROUGH 21

Student Group	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	White	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Two or more races	All Race/Ethnicities
Number of Disciplinary Removals per Child with a Disability	0.2	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2

Explanatory Note: The number of disciplinary removals per child with a disability (IDEA), ages 3 through 21, by race/ethnicity category. The numerator is the total number of disciplinary removals in a particular race/ethnicity category and the denominator is the total number of children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 21, in a particular race/ethnicity category as of the state-designated child count date (between October 1 and December 1, 2014). Data reported for IDEA 2014-15 Discipline and 2014 Child Count and Educational Environments.

Parental Involvement

INDICATOR 8: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (FFY 2015 APR, 2017)

	State (%)
Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	83.0
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of parents from whom a response is requested is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

Preschool Outcomes

INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2015 APR, 2017)

Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in each of the following outcomes, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program in the outcome of:	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	88.1
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	87.5
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	88.6
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each of the following outcomes by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	65.5
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	63.3
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	77.6
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state. The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center provides a national summary of the outcomes for children served through IDEA's early childhood programs annually at http://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/childoutcomeshighlights.pdf .	

Post School Outcomes

INDICATOR 14: POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2015 APR, 2017)

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were:	State (%)
Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	28.3
Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	54.3
Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school	67.8
Explanatory Note: State-selected data source. Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

x Data have been suppressed to protect personally identifiable information due to small cell counts.

<=3 Data in the cell are less than or equal to three.

- Data not available.

* Data flagged due to questionable data quality. These data violated data quality edit checks. Additional information explaining the discrepancies in the data may be available in the data notes documents.

Note: Sum of percentages may not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

References: Additional information clarifying states' data submissions are available in the data notes documents on <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html#datanotes>. Additional state-level data on children with disabilities (IDEA) can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/state-level-data-files/index.html>, <http://www.data.gov>, <https://eddataexpress.ed.gov/>, <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/>, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>, and <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Information on U.S. Department of Education Special Education funding can be found at: <https://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/osep/2015apps.html>.

Kansas

2017 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
82.92	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	17	70.83
Compliance	20	19	95

2017 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	90	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	22	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	36	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	90	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	54	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	93	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	27	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92	1

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	17	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma ¹	81	2

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2017: Part B."

2017 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.86	Yes	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.85	Yes	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.74	Yes	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	86.36		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Special Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

¹ Graduated with a regular high school diploma as defined under the *IDEA* Section 618 State-reported data: These students exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR §300.102(a)(3)(iv), “the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards, such as a certificate or general educational development credential (GED).”

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/13198>

Kansas

2017 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
82.92	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	17	70.83
Compliance	20	19	95

2017 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	90	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	22	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	36	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	90	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	54	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	93	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	27	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92	1

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	17	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma ¹	81	2

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2017: Part B."

2017 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.86	Yes	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.85	Yes	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.74	Yes	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	86.36		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Special Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

¹ Graduated with a regular high school diploma as defined under the *IDEA* Section 618 State-reported data: These students exited an educational program through receipt of a high school diploma identical to that for which students without disabilities are eligible. These students met the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As defined in 34 CFR §300.102(a)(3)(iv), “the term regular high school diploma does not include an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards, such as a certificate or general educational development credential (GED).”

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/13198>

Self-Scoring Rubric for Part B -
APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2017 Submission

Please read the following guidelines before completing the Rubric for Part B - Timely and Accurate Data:

This rubric is a worksheet to assist in compiling data for the timeliness and accuracy of State reported data.

In each cell, select **1** if your State met the requirements for the given APR indicator or 618 data collection, **0** if your State did not meet the requirements, and **"N/A"** if the requirement is not applicable to your State.

Please see below the definitions for the terms used in this worksheet.

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

618 Data

1) Timely – Data for tables for 618 are submitted on or before each tables' due date.

2) Complete Data – No missing sections. No placeholder data. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check - 618 data submissions do not have missing cells or internal inconsistencies. (See <https://www.ideadata.org/618DataCollection.asp> regarding data edits).

4) Responded to Data Note Request - Provided written explanation, as requested, of year to year changes for inclusion in Data Notes to accompany 618 data submissions.

FFY 2015 APR-- Kansas

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	N/A	N/A
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	19
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2015 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	24.00

618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Child Count/LRE Due Date: 4/6/2016	1	1	1	1	4
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/16	1	0	0	N/A	1
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/16	1	0	0	N/A	1
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/16	1	0	1	N/A	2
State Assessment Due Date: 12/14/16	1	0	1	N/A	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/16	1	1	1	N/A	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/16	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	16
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.09) =		17.45

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	24.00
B. 618 Grand Total	17.45
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	41.45
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
Base	48.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.864
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	86.36

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 1.0909 for 618



Kansas

IDEA Part B - Dispute Resolution

School Year: 2015-16

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

1.	Total number of written signed complaints filed.	34
1.1	Complaints with reports issued.	20
1.1.a	Reports with findings of noncompliance.	14
1.1.b	Reports within timelines.	20
1.1.c	Reports within extended timelines.	0
1.2	Complaints pending.	1
1.2.a	Complaints pending a due process hearing.	1
1.3	Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	13

Section B: Mediation Requests

2.	Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	23
2.1	Mediations held.	20
2.1.a	Mediations held related to due process complaints.	4
2.1.a.i	Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	1
2.1.b	Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	16
2.1.b.i	Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	13
2.2	Mediations pending.	0
2.3	Mediations withdrawn or not held.	3

Section C: Due Process Complaints

3.	Total number of due process complaints filed.	12
3.1	Resolution meetings.	5
3.1.a	Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	3
3.2	Hearings fully adjudicated.	3
3.2.a	Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	1
3.2.b	Decisions within extended timeline.	2
3.3	Due process complaints pending.	1
3.4	Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	8

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

4.	Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	2
4.1	Expedited resolution meetings.	0
4.1.a	Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
4.2	Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	1
4.2.a	Change of placement ordered.	1
4.3	Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
4.4	Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	1

Comment:

Additional Comment:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by Kansas. These data were generated on 10/20/2016.