Kansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the measurement and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77.14%. These data represent slippage from the State revised FFY 2006 data of 80.93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 87.1%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the measurement and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.82%. These data represent progress from the State's revised FFY 2006 data of 4.89%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 1.46%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 80%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 84.6%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.36% for reading and 99.17% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 98.1% for reading and 98.1% for math. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 97.2%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 70.01% for reading and 66.19% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 64.2% for reading and 60.3% for math. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 64.2% in reading and 64.6% in math.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are .34%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of .34%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 1.79%. The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the one LEA identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006. The State identified one LEA with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007. For the one district identified with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2006 data whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) in the prior year, the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 through the review of policies, procedures and practices pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 as a result of its review of policies, procedures and practices was corrected in a timely manner. As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies and procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Kansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</th><th>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</th><th>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</th></tr>
<tr><td>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

[Results Indicator]</td><td>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</td><td>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;

B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or

C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

[Results Indicator]</td><td>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FFY 2006 Data</th><th>FFY 2007 Data</th><th>FFY 2007 Target</th><th>Progress</th></tr>
<tr><td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td><td>60.8</td><td>60.5</td><td>Increase to 58</td><td>-0.30%</td></tr>
<tr><td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td><td>7.9</td><td>7.49</td><td>Decrease to 9.2</td><td>+0.41%</td></tr>
<tr><td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td><td>2.61</td><td>2.19</td><td>Decrease to 2.45</td><td>+0.42%</td></tr>
</table>
These data represent progress for 5B & 5C from the FFY 2006 data.

The State met its FFY 2007 targets.</td><td>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing</td><td>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</td><td>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</th><th>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</th><th>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</th></tr>
<tr><td>peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

[Results Indicator]</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

[Results Indicator]</td><td>The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:
<table>
<tr><th>07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th><th>Social Emotional</th><th>Knowledge & Skills</th><th>Appropriate Behavior</th></tr>
<tr><td>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td><td>.76</td><td>.59</td><td>.59</td></tr>
<tr><td>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>9.08</td><td>8.79</td><td>7.13</td></tr>
<tr><td>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td><td>24.32</td><td>27.16</td><td>13.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>33.06</td><td>33.15</td><td>34.25</td></tr>
<tr><td>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>32.77</td><td>30.31</td><td>44.52</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total (approx. 100%)</td><td>99.99%</td><td>100.00%</td><td>99.99%</td></tr>
</table></td><td>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. 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.

[Results Indicator]</td><td>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 62.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 58.87%.

The State met its FFY 2007 target of 58.9%.</td><td>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</td></tr>
</table>

Kansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of .68%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported that 2 of 2 LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301-300.311.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the disproportionate representation requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of .68%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported that two of two LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301-300.311.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the disproportionate representation requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.1%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that its one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.52%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.28%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities, and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89.19%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that the four districts with 26 student files with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator corrected that noncompliance in a timely manner.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner. Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s); and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case of noncompliance, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 89.8%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 89.8%.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that the 129 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e). In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In addition, in responding to Indicators 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators. In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the measurement and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two fully adjudicated hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 42.1%. These data are based on eight of 19 resolution sessions that resulted in settlement agreements. OSEP is unable to determine whether or not these data represent progress or slippage because fewer than 10 resolution sessions were conducted in FFY 2006.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

Kansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2007 target of 35.4%.	
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's reported data for this indicator are 73.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 82%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 77%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 94.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.