

Welcome to the Special Education Advisory Council Meeting



Please be sure your microphone is muted until you wish to participate in an open discussion with the council.

The meeting will start promptly at 9:00.

How to pin the Interpreters Video

At the top of your meeting window, hover over the video of the participant you want to pin and click ...
From the menu, click Pin.

Optional: If you want to pin additional videos (up to 9 total), follow steps 1 & 2 again as needed.

Optional: If you have at least 3 participants in the meeting and dual monitor enabled, you will have the option to pin to your first screen or your second screen.





Special Education Advisory Council



September 15, 2022

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

Call to Order

- Welcome
- Roll Call



Approvals

- Agenda for today, September 15, 2022
- Minutes April 14, 2022, and July 26, 2022



Public Comment

- Guidelines for Testimony
 - Prior to start of the SEAC meeting, be sure to email Kayla Love, klove@ksde.org expressing desire to speak during public comment.
 - All comments will be taken under advisement by the council.
 - Any response from the Council to public comments will come at a later date.
- Verbal Public Comment
 - Verbal comments are limited to three minutes.
 - Cue will be given one minute before time expires.
- Written Testimony
 - Written input must include the name, address and county of residence of the person submitting comment.
 - Written comments can be submitted via email, mail, or fax to the secretary of the SEAC.



SETS New Employee Introductions

Bert Moore



SPP/APR

Brian Dempsey



FFY 2020 SPP/APR



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



Kansas Performance on the FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Indicator	Did Kansas Meet the Target?	Did Kansas have Slippage?
1: Graduation	Baseline Year	NA
2: Drop Out	Met Target	No Slippage
3A: Participation for Students with IEPs	Baseline Year	NA
3B: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	Baseline Year	NA
3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)	Baseline Year	NA
3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	Baseline Year	NA
4A: Suspension/Expulsion	Baseline Year	NA
4B: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity	Baseline Year	NA
5: Education Environments (5-year-old kindergarteners-21)	Met Target	No Slippage
6: Preschool Environments	Met Target	No Slippage



Kansas Performance on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Indicator	Did Kansas Meet the Target?	Did Kansas have Slippage?
7: Preschool Outcomes	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
8: Parent Involvement	Met Target	No Slippage
9: Disproportionate Representation	Baseline Year	NA
10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories	Baseline Year	NA
11: Child Find	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
12: Early Childhood Transition	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
13: Secondary Transition	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
14: Post-School Outcomes	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage



Kansas Performance on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Indicator	Did Kansas Meet the Target?	Did Kansas have Slippage?
15: Resolution Sessions	Met Target	No Slippage
16: Mediation	Met Target	No Slippage
17: State Systemic Improvement Plan	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage



Indicators for Which Kansas Did Not Meet Target



Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Indicator	FFY 2020 Kansas Target	FFY 2020 Kansas Data
7A1	89.63%	88.85%
7B2	62.25%	61.00%
7C1	90.12%	89.58%
7C2	75.76%	75.23%

Item 1 focuses on of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Item 2 focuses on the percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in a given outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

- Percent of children ages 3–5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
 - 7A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
 - 7B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
 - 7C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
- Kansas reports using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center Child Outcomes Summary Form process.
- KSDE is in the process of examining a number of factors that may have contributed to the decrease in performance on these targets including school building closure and change in instructional delivery models due to the COVID-19 interruption, staff turnover at the local level, and increased requests for technical assistance with data entry.



Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2020 Kansas Target	FFY 2020 Kansas Data
100%	99.11%

- Percent of children who were evaluated within the State-established time frame (60 school days) of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.
- Kansas reports using data collected in the Kansas Integrated Accountability System web application.
- Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator and the required target is 100%.
 - Kansas missed 100% compliance in FFY 20 by 24 students.



Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2020 Kansas Target	FFY 2020 Kansas Data
100%	99.85%

- Percent of children Part C refers prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and for whom Part B develops and implements an IEP by their third birthdays.
- Kansas reports using data collected in the Kansas Integrated Accountability System web application.
- Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator and the required target is 100%.
 - Kansas missed 100% compliance in FFY 2020 by three students.



Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

FFY 2020 Kansas Target	FFY 2020 Kansas Data
100%	99.08%

- Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- Kansas reports using data collected in the Kansas Integrated Accountability System web application.
- Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator and the required target is 100%.
 - Kansas missed 100% compliance in FFY 2019 by four items of noncompliance.



Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Indicator	FFY 2020 Kansas Target	FFY 2020 Kansas Data
14A	35.54%	27.46%
14B	60.07%	59.19%
14C	74.72%	69.77%

- Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:
 - 14A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
 - 14B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
 - 14C: 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.
- Kansas obtains this data by surveying youth one year after leaving high school.
- An examination of state-level data for this indicator suggests the slippage may be attributed to the COVID-19 interruption, which has affected access to other postsecondary settings, possibly making it less likely students are participating. It also affected employment. Nearly 9% of exiters reported being laid off from a job as a result of COVID-19 and 195 reported a reduction in work hours.



State Level of Determination



Meet Requirements

- Kansas received the highest level of determination possible. Kansas has received this determination for well over ten consecutive years.
- Areas of growth for Kansas are in the area of children with disabilities who dropped out and scoring at basic or above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress.



Differentiated Monitoring

Brian Dempsey



Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS 2.0)



Summary

- In 2016, OSEP began providing differentiated monitoring and support (DMS) to States as part of its Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system under Parts B and C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Under RDA, OSEP made a shift from monitoring based solely on compliance with IDEA requirements to monitoring and support focused on both compliance and improving results for infants, toddlers, children with disabilities referred to and/or served under the IDEA (collectively referred to as children with disabilities).



FISCAL MANAGEMENT

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>An effective fiscal management system</p>	<p>The State has a thorough understanding of the IDEA and cross-cutting Federal fiscal requirements.</p>	<p>The State will have internal controls in place to ensure compliance with IDEA and cross-cutting Federal fiscal requirements.</p>	<p>The State will be able to document oversight of the use of IDEA funds.</p>	<p>The State and LEA/EIS programs will use IDEA funds for their intended purposes in a manner that is reasonable, necessary, and allocable to the IDEA.</p>	<p>An effective fiscal management system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>
<p>DEFINITION</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	
<p>A system designed to ensure that IDEA funds are distributed and expended in accordance with Federal fiscal requirements. A State's fiscal management system will include documentation of required budgetary information, policies and procedures reflecting IDEA, EDGAR, and Uniform Guidance requirements and evidence of implementation of those procedures all of which assist States in using Federal funds for improving performance and outcomes for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and procedures (manuals, user guides for applicable requirements and key Part B and Part C fiscal processes), as well as description the State's general supervision system. • Information on State structure (e.g., budget office and program office; interagency agreements; examples of contracts; organizational charts) • Description of Educational Service Agencies/regional Part C structures roles/responsibilities for fiscal requirements • Data systems used by the State, with specific reference to data sources relevant to fiscal processes and oversight • Description of fiscal TA accessed by the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational charts • Documentation related to the SEA/LA's allocation of funding, including IDEA Part B/C funds, to its LEA/EIS programs and providers • Risk assessment policies and procedures, calculations of risk, rubrics related to the assignment of risk categories, including LEA/EIS programs that do not meet audit thresholds, related to monitoring processes, as appropriate. • Budget and expenditure data for a particular year for the purpose of calculating MOE/MFS. • PART C: Example(s) of agreement(s) with EIS programs/providers/vendors/agencies providing Part C EIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example of reports from data system for accuracy of billing, payments etc. • Fiscal monitoring reports • Part B interactive spreadsheets • Part C budgets • PART C: System of payments implementation – payor source, ability to pay, access to insurance, interim payments etc. • Notifications to LEA/EIS programs of upcoming fiscal monitoring activities • Description of procedures for resolving IDEA-related single audit and monitoring findings for LEA/EIS programs • List and documentation of IDEA-related single audit findings/corrective actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation supporting State's implementation of its procedures for the timely disbursement/reimbursement of IDEA funds • Documentation related to compliance with cost principles of subpart E of the Uniform Guidance • Fiscal monitoring reports that include findings, documentation supporting corrective action, and closeout reporting • Documentation demonstrating the implementation of the Method if applicable (e.g., documentation/State forms related to the use of funds to support staff/activities described in the State's Method and SOP procedures) 	



IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yearly timeline for reviewing data sources, calculating, and issuing IDEA allocations, release of funds, and reallocation considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of SEA's single audit findings for the past 3 years, with status report on any unresolved findings Oversight Agency Reports (ex: Legislative review, OIG, policy groups, State task force) of SEA/LA internal processes 	<p>findings/corrective actions for LEA/EIS programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal monitoring protocols PART B: List of charter school LEAs that opened/ closed/significantly expanded/changed status Policies and procedures reflecting the SEA/LA's standards for correcting fiscal noncompliance PART C: The State's Method to ensure the provision of, and financial responsibility, Part C Services (Draft or Final), if applicable Policies and procedures related to parental notification/consent provisions for (Public/Private) Insurance Sample State consent forms related to access to (Public/Private) Insurance Fiscal data system procedures/screenshots, demonstrating the system's capacity for oversight of funds for the Part B/Part C programs PART B: Sample calculations and budget documents for determining the maximum amount of funds available for voluntary CEIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information memos, guidance documents, and training/professional development agendas to LEA/EIS programs on topics related to IDEA, EDGAR, and Uniform Guidance fiscal requirements, annual applications/plans, budgets, fiscal monitoring and enforcement, reallocation of funds and other topics as identified 	



INTEGRATED MONITORING | SUSTAINING COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>An effective Integrated monitoring system</p>	<p>The State continuously examines and analyzes data across multiple sources to evaluate its performance, and that of its LEA/EIS programs for improved results and compliance.</p>	<p>The State identifies noncompliance with procedural and programmatic requirements and makes recommendations for performance improvements.</p>	<p>The State requires the LEA/EIS programs to correct identified noncompliance.</p>	<p>An effective integrated monitoring system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>
<p>DEFINITION</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	
<p>A multifaceted process or system which is designed to examine and evaluate States with a particular emphasis on educational results, functional outcomes and compliance with IDEA procedural and programmatic requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring policies/procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-assessments (State-level or LEA/EIS programs) • Timeline for monitoring • Criteria for identifying LEA/EIS programs for monitoring • Description of how the State analyzes data for CWD and all students • Additional data sources they are using (IDEA/ESEA) • Documentation of Stakeholder engagement activities and work • Evidence of State cross analysis of different factors and data points that contribute to identified issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring reports with findings • Description of processes in manual • Tools to conduct monitoring • Training of LEA/EIS programs • Examples of improvement plans • Description of Stakeholder engagement and activities related to compliance and performance improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Root cause analysis to identify what is behind the performance data • Evidence of TA provided and outcomes as a result of the TA provided • Documentation of what corrective actions were required and/or improvement plans 	



IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>A system designed to Sustain Compliance and Improvement</p> <hr/> <p>A system for recognizing, and improving compliance and performance including use of improvement activities, incentives, and sanctions.</p>	<p>The State uses a system of incentives and sanctions to ensure continued improvement and IDEA compliance.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a general supervision system which includes a defined system of incentives and sanctions for compliance with IDEA Documentation of enforcement policies that explain the consequences of violating regulations, policies, and procedures. Policies related to Incentives for improved performance and compliance Written State monitoring procedures Sample of corrective action (reports and timelines) Valid and reliable data on State monitoring of LEA/EIS programs 	<p>LEA/EIS programs develop and implement improvement activities and corrective actions to address areas in need of improvement and noncompliance.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA and EIS procedural manuals including at a minimum; methods for determining non-compliance, steps-to-correct, timelines, sanctions and incentives Evidence of the implementation and evaluation of improvement activities, and how stakeholders are involved Verification of correction of systemic and individual noncompliance Evidence State collects and reviews LEA/EIS program tracking mechanisms for noncompliance Audit reports Sample of Corrective Actions (reports and timelines) 	<p>The State verifies that LEA/EIS programs have implemented improvement activities and corrected noncompliance.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verification of the correction of systemic and individual noncompliance Records of enforcement actions taken against LEA/EIS programs Records of technical assistance provided to LEA/EIS programs related to noncompliance and program improvement Tracking noncompliance (statistics, frequency, areas of need) Samples of LEA/EIS program documents or compliance reports Close out reports, evidence of correction Revised policies and procedures, if applicable Evidence of the Implementation of the revised policies and procedures Evidence of change in practices from attendees of trainings Updated data showing improvement 	<p>A system designed to sustain compliance and improvement will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>



DISPUTE RESOLUTION | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>An effective dispute resolution system</p>	<p>Parents and other stakeholders will be informed of their rights under the law.</p>	<p>The State timely resolves disputes about IDEA procedures and the provision of FAPE in the LRE or EIS.</p>	<p>LEA/EIS programs provide FAPE in the LRE/EIS to eligible infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.</p>	<p>An effective dispute resolution system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>
<p>DEFINITION</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	
<p>A system designed as part of a State’s general supervisory responsibility to ensure implementation of IDEA’s dispute resolution procedures consistent with IDEA requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedural safeguards notice (dispute resolution components) • Evidence of receipt of Procedural Safeguards (signature page, file review during monitoring) • Model forms for State complaints and due process • Review of communication to MSIP Customer service • News articles or pending lawsuits • State websites for access to forms and safeguards • LEA/EIS program examples of model forms • Policies and procedures regarding timing of safeguards, use of model forms, and information required in State complaints and hearing notices • Information on requesting mediation (info in notice, website, etc.) • Evidence of availability of hearing decisions to SAP/ICC and/or public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 618 data • Evidence of hearing officer’s decisions, state complaint actions, mediation agreements • Evidence of training provided to hearing officers and mediators • Description of how the Due Process System is established in the State • Part C programs – policies and procedures for Part C due process hearing procedures or adoption of Part B hearing procedures • Documentation that appeal rights are included in hearing decisions • Tracking documents for Dispute resolution systems (State Complaint, Due Process and mediation) • Policies around timelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely Correction of noncompliance (individual and systemic) • Evidence of implementation of remedies ordered by hearing officer or State (compensatory services, monetary reimbursement, IEP/IFSP Team meetings) • Evidence of technical assistance • Review any Memorandums of agreements or contracts with the entity responsible for conducting the hearings • Any supplemental guides or Q & A Documents the States have developed to provide guidance to their Stakeholders related to Dispute Resolution activities 	



IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>An effective system for targeted technical assistance and professional development</p> <hr/> <p>A system of technical assistance and professional development that uses data-informed root cause analysis areas to address State priorities and areas in need of improvement.</p>	<p>The States uses all available data/information to prioritize which areas need improvement.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools/ mechanisms to collect data that would inform targeted TA or identified area(s) for improvement • Evidence of how the State is triangulating or analyzing their data. • Monitoring reports • 616/618 Data Reports • Description of State TA/PD activities within the State • Description of how the State identifies the types of TA/PD activities they provide • Outline of stakeholder’s involvement in development of TA/PD activities 	<p>The State identifies TA/PD offerings that are aligned to those areas in need of improvement.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of dissemination and communication of available TA/PD • Description of State’s analysis of data to inform TA/PD activities 	<p>The State prioritizes the delivery of TA/PD in those areas in need of improvement.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State level or LEA/EIS program best practices for implementing IDEA. • Description of the delivery method of the TA/PD activities the State are developing and implementing • Review the State’s description of TA/PD in the SPP/APR introduction • Evidence of alignment with other programs/initiatives (e.g. SPDG) (e.g., meeting notes, agendas, etc.) • Evidence of stakeholder involvement in identifying needs on TA/PD activities 	<p>An effective system for targeted technical assistance and professional development will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>



DATA | SPP/APR

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>An effective system to collect and report timely and accurate data</p>	<p>The State collects and reports valid and reliable data that are timely submitted to the Secretary and the public.</p>	<p>The State analyzes data for strategic planning and equitable allocation of resources.</p>	<p>The State uses data to support implementation of strategies that are most closely aligned to improved outcomes.</p>	<p>An effective system to collect and report timely and accurate data will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>
<p>DEFINITION</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</p>	
<p>A data system designed to ensure that the data collected and reported are valid and reliable and that information is reported to the Department and the public in a timely manner. The data system will inform and focus a State’s improvement activities as well as verifying that the data collected and reported reflect actual practice and performance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of data collection system(s) • Reports/Screen Shots of data systems • Walk through demonstration of data system • Documentation of Datagovernance requirements • Manuals or evidence reflecting the Edit Checks/Business Rules within their data system • Data manuals • Description of data process/oversight • Organizational Chart related to data and roles and responsibilities • TA/PA trainings for data users • EDFacts Data Quality Reports • APR Data Matrix • Data sharing agreements • Public Reporting • Evidence of meaningful stakeholder involvement • Evidence that the State has a system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/Timeline for examining LEA/EIS program data • Guidelines for using data to inform monitoring/TA • Evidence that the State uses its data systems to plan for new initiatives • Evidence that the State compiles and integrates data across systems and uses the data to inform and focus its improvement activities • Models for root cause analysis • Evidence of how root cause analysis is used • Process for making data informed decisions at the State level • Guidance and/or training to LEA/EIS programs to use data to inform decision making • Training and guidance for LEA/EIS programs on how to analyze data. • Evidence such as a data sharing agreement, MOU, or information attained during OSEP interviews that State level Part C and Part B 619 staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline of data pulls for implementation of strategies • Documentation of analysis of data trends • Evidence that the State supports a data driven culture at the LEA/EIS program level to ensure LEA/EIS programs carry out evidence-based practices with fidelity (e.g. trainings, user manuals, guidance etc.) • Identification of high and low performing LEA/EIS programs based on data • Evidence of identification of best practices through the use of data • Additional sources of data beyond 616 and 618 data at both State and LEA/EIS program level • Evidence that the State uses its data systems (e.g., monitoring, self-assessment, database, due process, and State complaints) to improve program and systems operations • Evidence that outcomes data within 	



IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>A State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)</p>	<p>The State executes an approvable plan that evaluates the State’s efforts to implement IDEA requirements and purposes and the plan describes how the State will improve IDEA implementation.</p>	<p>The State reports annually to the Secretary on the performance of the State under the SPP/APR. The SPP/APR demonstrates the State’s progress towards meeting the measurable and rigorous targets for each indicator that have been developed with stakeholder input. The State has a plan in place to address needed improvement.</p>	<p>The State will work with LEA/EIS programs to address needed improvement, in those areas that are most closely related to improved outcomes.</p>	<p>An SPP/APR that demonstrates progress on compliance and results indicators will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>
<p>A multifaceted plan that evaluates the State’s efforts to implement the requirements and purpose of the IDEA and describes how the State will improve its implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An approved SPP/APR • Policies and procedures around the SPP/APR • Evidence of stakeholder input in the development and the implementation of the SPP/APR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPP/APR • Improvement activities • Cross indicator analysis • Reasons for slippage • Plans in place to address slippage • Policies and procedures around data submission • Valid and reliable data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Reporting • Training to LEA/EIS programs on Indicator Analysis and Evaluation • Policies and procedures around data submission • Valid and reliable data 	



IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
<p>Effective implementation of policies and procedures</p>	<p>The State develops policies and procedures that are aligned with IDEA and other Federal requirements.</p>	<p>The State effectively implements its policies and procedures.</p>	<p>The State ensures that LEA/EIS programs are knowledgeable about the policies and procedures.</p>	<p>LEA/EIS programs effectively implement policies and procedures that ensure the provision of FAPE in the LRE and EIS.</p>	<p>Effective implementation of policies and procedures will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</p>
<p>Policies and procedures outline the goals, objectives, processes and statutory requirements of a Part B and Part C Program, that are implemented with fidelity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual IDEA Grant Application • Evidence of systematic and periodic review of implementation of specific policies and procedures • Evidence of policies and procedures being publicly available • Evidence of accessible policies and procedures on State’s Website • Review of communication to MSIP Customer service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of LEA/EIS program implementation of the State’s policies and procedures • LEA/EIS program websites demonstrating consistency with State policies and procedures related to IDEA • The State monitoring reports of LEA/EIS programs on implementation of State policies and procedures • Evidence of periodic review of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of dissemination of State policies and procedures • Evidence of State TA/PD related to implementation of policies and procedures to its LEA/EIS programs • Documentation of the State process for identifying barriers to LEA/EIS program implementation through root cause analysis • Documentation of what LEA/EIS program corrective actions were required and/or improvement plans, if applicable • Evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement during implementation, and evaluation of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures • Sample documents (largest LEA/EIS programs, Redacted documents such as IEP/IFSPs, to verify implementation/compliance) • Evidence of LEA/EIS program methods for identifying noncompliance • Examples of LEA/EIS program improvement plans 	



Phased Monitoring

- Phase 1: Document Request and Protocol Interviews: The OSEP monitoring team will begin working with the State to prepare for the Phase 2 visit. Phase 1 will occur 5 months prior to the Phase 2 onsite/virtual visit. The OSEP monitoring team will review all publicly available information prior to working with the State.
 - a. 5 months prior to the Phase 2 visit OSEP will send a document request for relevant information we have not found in our initial research. Please refer to the suggested documents listed below for an initial list of the information we are seeking.
 - b. 4 months prior to the Phase 2 visit OSEP will conduct targeted interviews with State staff on the component-specific protocols.



- Phase 2: On-site/Virtual Visit through issuing of the Monitoring Report: Based on information collected during the Phase 1 work, OSEP will develop an agenda for the on-site/virtual visit focusing on the issues that require further exploration, deeper looks or additional discussions.



- Phase 3: Close-out and Follow-up: In the year following the on-site visit, the OSEP State Lead will work with the State to ensure correction of any remaining outstanding findings, provide technical assistance, and support, and discuss progress in improving identified results areas.





Bert Moore
Director
Special Education & Title Services
(785) 291-3097
bmoore@ksde.org

Brian Dempsey
Assistant Director
Special Education & Title Services
(785) 296-5522
bmoore@ksde.org

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.





Break

Low Incidence License

Shane Carter





Lunch

ESI Regulations

Scott Gordon





Break

KSDE Update

Bert Moore



Council Ex-Officio Member Reports



Ex-Officio Member Reports

- Families Together
- Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators (KASEA)
– Ashley Enz
- Disability Rights Center
- Kansas State Board of Education
- Others



Keep The Main Thing The Main Thing



6/19/2023

Kansas State Department of Education | www.ksde.org | #KansansCan

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.



Closing Comments/Adjournment

- Next SEAC Meeting: November 9, 2022
- Items for next agenda
- Motion to adjourn





Bert Moore
Director
Special Education & Title Services
(785) 291-3097
bmoore@ksde.org

Kayla Love
Administrative Specialist
Special Education & Title Services
(785) 291-3097
klove@ksde.org

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.

