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

January 13, 2022

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.
Call to Order

• Welcome

• Roll Call
Approvals

• Agenda for today, January 13, 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.
Federal Funds
Dean Zajic
Christy Weiler
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KSDE Federal Funds Presentation

January 13, 2022
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A Primer on Federal Funding
History and General Requirements

"My cow for your magic beans? It's a deal... subject to approval by our attorneys, of course."

CartoonStock.com
Special Education Funding is Special

• Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) aid includes many program requirements that aren’t found in other federal education programs
  • Maintenance of Effort at the State and Local Level
  • Special Education must always be in excess of services made available to all students
  • State and local funding models may not induce placement into more restrictive environments
  • IDEA includes explicit requirements that funds must be returned when provisions are not met
  • With very, very limited exceptions, provisions may not be waived.
Improving Student Outcomes Through Fiscal Monitoring
Accountability System Overview

Kansas Integrated Accountability System (KIAS)

- Timely & Accurate Data
- Correction of Findings
- Youth Outcomes Driven Accountability (YODA) Analysis
- LEA Single Audits
- Consolidated Fiscal Monitoring
- IDEA File Review
- ESEA Program Monitoring

Identification of LEAs Requiring Most Intensive Support
An automated, online system that utilizes a combination of LEA self-reporting and random verification to ensure LEA compliance with both ESEA and IDEA specific- and crosscutting- requirements.
Does the LEA have a system in place to track and inventory all equipment purchased with federal funds? (2 CFR 200.313)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies/Procedures</th>
<th>Provider/Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is correct implementation of this regulatory requirement monitored?</td>
<td>Do all applicable staff know and understand the property management process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Evidence:**
- Policy Document
- Training Document
- Inventory Log
- Annual (or biennial) Inventory Results

Factors Included In YODA Analysis

- Graduation Rate
- Student Chronic Absenteeism
- Participation Rate in State Assessments
- State Assessment Results
- IDEA Level of Determination
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment
- Early Childhood Outcomes
- New Personnel
- New Programs
- New or Changing Systems
- Single Audit Results
- Timely Reporting of Data
- Monitoring Findings
- Timely Correction of Findings
- Complaint & Due Process
- Emergency Safety Interventions
- Participation in Alternate Assessments
Factors Included In YODA Analysis

- Graduation Rate
- Student Chronic Absenteeism
- Participation Rate in State Assessments
- State Assessment Results
- IDEA Level of Determination
- Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment
- Early Childhood Outcomes
- New Personnel

- New Programs
- New or Changing Systems
- Single Audit Results
- Timely Reporting of Data
- Monitoring Findings
- Timely Correction of Findings
- Complaint & Due Process
- Emergency Safety Interventions
- Participation in Alternate Assessments
Incorporating Fiscal Into the System

Total Federal Funds Expended
- Focuses oversight on LEAs that receive the most funding and therefore pose the greatest risk to the federal interest
- This can allow smaller LEAs to fly under the radar

Single Audit
- Provides an additional layer of consistent fiscal oversight by external entities for most LEAs, on an annual basis
- Need to differentiate between LEAs that have no significant findings vs. not required to be audited because of expenditure threshold

Consolidated Fiscal Monitoring
- Comprehensive review across federal programs
- Utilizes a combination of sampling and random verification on a three-year cycle
Coordinating and Sharing Information

Kansas Integrated Accountability System Core Team

- Standing Monthly Meeting
- Responsible for overseeing and updating the fully system of supports
- Composed of staff responsible for ESEA and IDEA programs as well as fiscal

Youth Outcome Driven Accountability Leads

- Standing Monthly Meeting
- Reports on, and coordinates support for, YODA LEAs
- Includes the KIAS Core Team as well as the assigned lead to each YODA LEA
Systemic Review of Fiscal Risk Leads to Better Program Decisions

SEA Level analysis of multiple metrics leads to better differentiation in the nature and intensity of technical assistance for each district
Finding related to internal controls - significant deficiencies or material weaknesses or significant instances of abuse identified.

Management's Response: The District agrees with the finding. We believe it would be inefficient and cost prohibitive for our staff to attempt to stay current on all the requirements of GAAP. We do not plan to make any changes at this time. However, we will monitor this situation and periodically determine if it is cost effective for us to perform these functions.
District operates a centralized early childhood center
Head Start, State Funded At-Risk Pre-K, Special Education, Migrant Program, and Fee-based
The center has a single curriculum that is consistently implemented in all 20+ classrooms
And yet, kids were being segregated by funding:
  ▪ Students with Disabilities
  ▪ Migrant Students
  ▪ Student Eligible for At-Risk
  ▪ Head Start
Report Fraud Wasted And Abuse

IF YOU SUSPECT ANY WRONGDOING, REPORT IT:

Call 1-800-MIS-USED
Or Visit
https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/hotline.html
Questions?
Update Secondary Transition
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Kansas Transition Coordinating Council

Purpose

The mission of the Kansas Transition Coordinating Council (KTCC) is to ensure each student with a disability, in the state of Kansas, is supported and prepared for post-school life. The purpose of KTCC is to convene stakeholders from Kansas’ state and local agencies focused on seamless transition from education to post-school outcomes for youth and young adults with disabilities. KTCC will empower dynamic collaborations with its partners, stay solution focused, and be open to sharing resources to inform and provide supports to all stakeholders. (revised 11/4/20)
KTCC Members

• KS Vocational Rehabilitation
• Families Together, Inc.
• KS Association of Special Education Administrators (KASEA)
• KS Technical Assistance System Network- (TASN)
• KS University on Developmental Disabilities
• KS Department of Health and Environment-Working Healthy
• KS State Department of Education (KSDE)
KTCC Newsletter

Resource to communicate with others interested in secondary transition regarding upcoming professional development and sharing of resources.

- Quarterly
- Listservs
- https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RHUQN1kzWGyw5P2A75I2taZHjGk3kPq-/view?usp=sharing
Stacie Martin
Education Program Consultant
Special Education and Title Services
(785) 295-6855
smartin@ksde.org
Break
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report

Bert Moore
Brian Dempsey
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## SEAC Meeting – SPP/APR 2020–25

### January 13, 2022

**SPP/APR FFY 2020–25 Summary of Proposed Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Changes</th>
<th>What School Year is the Data From?</th>
<th>What SPP/APR Year Will We Begin Reporting These Changes?</th>
<th>What is the Submission Date of the SPP/APR That We Will Begin Reporting These Changes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1: Graduation</td>
<td>• Data source change from EDfacts files to 618 submission</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>FFY 2020</td>
<td>February 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2: Drop Out</td>
<td>• Data source change from EDfacts files to 618 submission, and calculation change</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>FFY 2020</td>
<td>February 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3: State Assessment for Students with IEPs</td>
<td>• 3A - Participation for students with IEPs (includes AA students) • 3B - Proficiency for students with IEPs (general ed assess) • 3C - Proficiency for students</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>FFY 2020</td>
<td>February 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary of Proposed Changes</td>
<td>What School Year is the Data From?</td>
<td>What SPP/APR Year Will We Begin Reporting These Changes?</td>
<td>What is the Submission Date of the SPP/APR That We Will Begin Reporting These Changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion | - Change identification from 5% to 2%  
- Revise N size and cell size to 10 | 2019-20 | FY 2020 | February 1, 2022 |
| Indicator 5: Education Environments for 5-Year-Old Kindergarteners through Age 21 | - Setting new baseline and targets | 2020-21 | FY 2020 | February 1, 2022 |
| Indicator 6: Preschool Environments | - Addition of 6C: Special education and related services in home setting | 2020-21 | FY 2020 | February 1, 2022 |

- 3D – Gap in proficiency rates (students w/ IEP scoring proficient or above subtracted from all students scoring proficient or above)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Changes</th>
<th>What School Year is the Data From?</th>
<th>What SPP/APR Year Will We Begin Reporting These Changes?</th>
<th>What is the Submission Date of the SPP/APR That We Will Begin Reporting These Changes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes</td>
<td>• Setting new baseline and targets • Set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>February 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 8: Parent Involvement</td>
<td>• Change sample plan to state census every year. • Change survey to one question: “Did the school district facilitate involvement as a means for improving services and results for your child?” • Demographic Questions: Continue with Disability</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>FY 2021</td>
<td>February 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary of Proposed Changes</td>
<td>What School Year is the Data From?</td>
<td>What SPP/APR Year Will We Begin Reporting These Changes?</td>
<td>What is the Submission Date of the SPP/APR That We Will Begin Reporting These Changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation | • Identical criteria for 2 years  
• Risk ratio of ≥3.00 for all categories except SL which is ≥4.5.  
• Required root cause analysis in Year 2 | 2020-21 | FY 2020 | February 1, 2022 |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories | • Identical criteria for 2 years  
• Risk ratio of ≥3.00 for all categories except SL which is ≥4.5.  
• Required root cause analysis in Year 2 | 2020-21 | FY 2020 | February 1, 2022 |
| Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes | • Move to census - every district every year.  
• Districts with 10 or less | 2021-22 | FY 2021 | February 1, 2023 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Changes</th>
<th>What School Year is the Data From?</th>
<th>What SPP/APR Year Will We Begin Reporting These Changes?</th>
<th>What is the Submission Date of the SPP/APR That We Will Begin Reporting These Changes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 15: Due Process Resolution Sessions</td>
<td>• Setting new baseline and targets</td>
<td>previous year (2020-21)</td>
<td>FFY 2020</td>
<td>February 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 16: Mediation</td>
<td>• Setting new baseline and targets</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>FFY 2020</td>
<td>February 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brian Dempsey  
Assistant Director  
Special Education and Title Services  
(785) 296-5522  
bdempsey@ksde.org
Graduation Task Force

Trisha Backman
Jim McNiece
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Why reexamine Kansas high school graduation requirements?

- Timeliness is critical in order to better meet the needs of students in the 21st century and reach the State Board’s vision to lead the world in the success of each student.
Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

Your purpose is to provide guidance to the State Board of Education with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities.

Today the State Board comes to you with a request for input into the review and possible modifications to the state’s High School Graduation Requirements.
Work of the Taskforce

The charge from the Commissioner and State Board Chair:
- Establish a Graduation Requirements Task Force (June 2021)
- Examine graduation requirements in Kansas from at least three lenses:
  • Identify courses to add or delete from current requirements (if any).
  • Review ways to demonstrate mastery of skills and competencies.
  • Study need for value-added assets in addition to high school diploma (i.e. industry-recognized certificate, CTE, college credits).
  • Ensure all students are included and all opportunities for success are studied.
Our Vision for Kansas ...

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.
Current Graduation Requirements

Kansas Minimum High School Graduation Requirements (21)

• 4 units of English Language arts
• 3 units of history and government
• 3 units of science
• 3 units of mathematics
• 1 unit of physical education, which shall include health
• 1 unit of fine arts
• 6 units of elective courses
Organization of Task Force

Leadership Team:
• Co-chairs:
  • Jim McNiece, Kansas State Board of Education.

Four subcommittees:
• Courses to add or delete, if any
• Demonstrate mastery and competency
• Value-added diplomas
• Special Needs Students
## Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Archer</td>
<td>Kansas Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Arnberger</td>
<td>Superintendent, Belle Plaine USD 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Arnold</td>
<td>Kansas State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Backman</td>
<td>Teacher, Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Benjamin</td>
<td>Former USD 229 Board of Education member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Bergsma</td>
<td>Goodland USD 352 Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Bielefeld</td>
<td>College/Career Readiness, Wichita USD 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Blew</td>
<td>Counselor, Minneola High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Brown</td>
<td>Counselor, Mulvane High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Clifford</td>
<td>Kansas State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Cole</td>
<td>Labette County USD 506 Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lona DuVall</td>
<td>Finney County Economic Dev., business leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task Force Members, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Eland</td>
<td>Teacher, Hoxie High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briana Evans</td>
<td>Counselor, Sabetha-Wetmore High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Faflick</td>
<td>Kansas State High School Activities Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danira Fernandez-Flores</td>
<td>Director Diploma Plus, Kansas City KS USD 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarred Fuhrman</td>
<td>Principal, Basehor-Linwood HS (Task Force Vice Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Haas</td>
<td>Kansas State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Harder</td>
<td>Textron Aviation, business leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Hill</td>
<td>Superintendent, Chautauqua County, USD 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Harshberger</td>
<td>Principal, Bishop Carroll Catholic High School-Wichita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Steve Huebert</td>
<td>Chair, House Committee on Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Kern</td>
<td>Curriculum Director, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Lewis</td>
<td>Superintendent, Lawrence USD 497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task Force Members, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Lindsey</td>
<td>President, Kansas Association of Independent Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Maurer</td>
<td>Teacher, Southeast High School-Wichita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McNiece</td>
<td>Kansas State Board of Education (Task Force Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Meyer</td>
<td>Principal, Eisenhower High School-Goddard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Nusser</td>
<td>Principal, Lyons High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Raines</td>
<td>Principal, Washburn Rural High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeAnn Richardson</td>
<td>Teacher, Schlagle High School-Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ryan</td>
<td>Smoky Valley USD 400 Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Springston</td>
<td>Curriculum Director, Dodge City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleen Tabor</td>
<td>Emprise Bank, business leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Tackett</td>
<td>Teacher, Salina Central High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task Force Members, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Urenda</td>
<td>Counselor, Shawnee Mission West High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Wally</td>
<td>PrepKC, business leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan West</td>
<td>Principal, Neodesha High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Younger</td>
<td>Superintendent, Ulysses USD 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff &amp; advisors from KSDE, KASB, USA-Kansas</td>
<td>Education Commission of the States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Task Force Steps

- Studied information and received presentations from other states updating or changing high school graduation requirements, including Ohio, Washington, Illinois and New Hampshire.
- Received data and support from Education Commission of the States.
- Received historical look at Kansas graduation requirements from Mark Tallman, Kansas Association of School Boards.
- Created work group focused on special needs students.

All meetings have been to date on ZOOM and are available at
Subcommittee Formation & Leadership

• Courses to add or delete (if any)
  • Christie Meyer, principal, Eisenhower High School, Goddard USD 265

• Mastery of skills and competencies demonstrated
  • Ed Raines, principal, Washburn Rural High School, Auburn-Washburn USD 437

• Value-added diplomas (i.e. industry-recognized certificate, college credits)
  • Kelly Nusser, principal, Lyons, High School USD 260

• Workgroup focused on Special Needs Students
  • Trisha Backman, teacher, Lawrence Gardner High School
Summary of Considerations (to date)

• Courses to add or delete (if any)
  • Keep credits at 21, allow more flexibility with course options instead of a one-track system; group courses directly related to a student’s Individual Plan of Study

• Mastery of skills and competencies demonstrated
  • Consider regulations impacting competency-based systems; decide what constitutes mastery of skill/content; study impact to “seat time.”

• Value-added diplomas (i.e. industry-recognized certificate, college credits)
  • Incorporate real-world experiences, internships, study ways to meet needs of all students and special populations)
Summary of Considerations

Issues and questions as we move forward:

• College credit, life experience credit, FAFSA, non-academic credits, time, funding, teacher prep, internships, accountability, etc.
• Project-Based Learning, Individual Plans of Study, Work-Based Learning, Waivers
• Can we already do the things we want within the present Graduation Requirements?
• Who is responsible by law for establishing Graduation Requirements?
• What does it mean to different stakeholder groups?
Stakeholder Input

That’s why we are here. We need your input!

• Go to the KSDE Website and access the link at https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Career-Standards-and-Assessment-Services/CSAS-Home/Graduation-and-Schools-of-Choice/Graduation-and-Dropouts

• Contact a Task Force member and speak directly to them.
SEAC Feedback, Comments and Recommendations

- Add and/or Delete Courses
- Mastery and Competency
- Value-Added Diplomas
- Special Considerations and Comments
Jan. 20, 2022: Subcommittee leaders present findings and recommendations to entire Task Force.

Spring 2022: Stakeholder input will be gathered and SBOE Report developed.

May 10, 2022: Recommendations presented to State Board of Education. Determination of next steps.
Thank you!
Lunch Break
Differentiated Monitoring Update

Bert Moore
Brian Dempsey
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This Framework outlines a State system that is:

- 100% focused on improved outcomes and results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families,
- Comprised of defined components,
- Integrated across components, and
- Nimble enough to address emerging issues.

The Framework outlines how all programs will be monitored on their general supervision systems.

General supervision encompasses the States’ responsibility to ensure that it and its subgrantees and contractors meet the requirements of IDEA which includes:

1. Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities; and
2. Ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B and C of IDEA and exercise their general supervision responsibilities over the programs and activities used to implement IDEA.

For each of the 8 components of a general supervision system, OSEP provides:

- A definition;
- A series of “if/then” statements which outlines the elements OSEP thinks is necessary to achieve the intended results; and
- A list of examples of the types of evidence that we have found helpful in understanding a State’s system within the specific component. This list is not exhaustive nor does it mean that a State is out of compliance if it does not have a specific item.

Components

- Fiscal Management
- Integrated Monitoring | Sustaining Compliance and Improvement
- Dispute Resolution | Technical Assistance and Professional Development
- Data | SPP/APR
- Implementation of Policies and Procedures

2
4
6
8
10
**Fiscal Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If a State Has</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Intended Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effective fiscal management system</td>
<td>The State has a thorough understanding of the IDEA and cross-cutting Federal fiscal requirements.</td>
<td>The State will have internal controls in place to ensure compliance with IDEA and cross-cutting Federal fiscal requirements.</td>
<td>The State will be able to document oversight of the use of IDEA funds.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>An effective fiscal management system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

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, children and with disabilities.

**Examples of Evidence**

- 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 State.
- Organizational charts.
- Documentation related to the SEA/IA’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/MPS.
- Part C: Example(s) of agreement(s) with EIS programs/providers/vendors/agencies providing Part C EIS.
- 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 and fiscal monitoring.
- 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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If A State Has</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Then</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly timeline for reviewing data sources, calculating, and issuing IDEA allocations, release of funds, and reallocation considerations</td>
<td>List of SEA’s single audit findings for the past 3 years, with status report on any unresolved findings</td>
<td>Oversight Agency Reports (ex: Legislative review, OIG, policy groups, State task force) of SEA/LA internal processes</td>
<td>Findings/corrective actions for LEA/EIS programs</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Agency Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal monitoring protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PART B: List of charter school LEAs that opened/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>closed/significantly expanded/changed status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies and procedures reflecting the SEA/LA’s standards for correcting fiscal noncompliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PART C: The State’s Method to ensure the provision of, and financial responsibility, Part C Services (Draft or Final), if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies and procedures related to parental notification/consent provisions for (Public/Private) Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample State consent forms related to access to (Public/Private) Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal data system procedures/screenshots, demonstrating the system’s capacity for oversight of funds for the Part B/Part C programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PART B: Sample calculations and budget documents for determining the maximum amount of funds available for voluntary CEIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INTEGRATED MONITORING | SUSTAINING COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF A STATE HAS</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effective Integrated monitoring system</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The State identifies noncompliance with procedural and programmatic requirements and makes recommendations for performance improvements.</td>
<td>The State requires the LEA/EIS programs to correct identified noncompliance.</td>
<td>An effective integrated monitoring system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEFINITION
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.

### EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF A STATE HAS</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effective Integrated monitoring system</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The State identifies noncompliance with procedural and programmatic requirements and makes recommendations for performance improvements.</td>
<td>The State requires the LEA/EIS programs to correct identified noncompliance.</td>
<td>An effective integrated monitoring system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE

- Monitoring policies/procedures
  - 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

- 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
- 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF A STATE HAS</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A system designed to Sustain Compliance and Improvement</td>
<td>The State uses a system of incentives and sanctions to ensure continued improvement and IDEA compliance.</td>
<td>LEA/EIS programs develop and implement improvement activities and corrective actions to address areas in need of improvement and noncompliance.</td>
<td>The State verifies that LEA/EIS programs have implemented improvement activities and corrected noncompliance.</td>
<td>A system designed to sustain compliance and improvement will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEFINITION
A system for recognizing, and improving compliance and performance including use of improvement activities, incentives, and sanctions.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE
- 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
- 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)
- 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

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IF A STATE HAS</strong></th>
<th><strong>PARENTS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS WILL BE INFORMED OF THEIR RIGHTS UNDER THE LAW.</strong></th>
<th><strong>THE STATE TIMELY RESOLVES DISPUTES ABOUT IDEA PROCEDURES AND THE PROVISION OF FAPE IN THE LRE OR EIS.</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEA/EIS PROGRAMS PROVIDE FAPE IN THE LRE/EIS TO ELIGIBLE INFANTS, TODDLERS, CHILDREN AND YOUTH WITH DISABILITIES.</strong></th>
<th><strong>AN INTENDED OUTCOME</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFINITION</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td><strong>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</strong></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td><strong>EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IF A STATE HAS</strong></td>
<td><strong>THEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>THEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>THEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTENDED OUTCOME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective system for targeted technical assistance and professional development</td>
<td>The States uses all available data/information to prioritize which areas need improvement.</td>
<td>The State identifies TA/PD offerings that are aligned to those areas in need of improvement.</td>
<td>The State prioritizes the delivery of TA/PD in those areas in need of improvement.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITION**
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.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**
- 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

- Evidence of dissemination and communication of available TA/PD
- Description of State’s analysis of data to inform TA/PD activities

- 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
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Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.
**DATA | SPP/APR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF A STATE HAS</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effective system to collect and report timely and accurate data</td>
<td>The State collects and reports valid and reliable data that are timely submitted to the Secretary and the public.</td>
<td>The State analyzes data for strategic planning and equitable allocation of resources.</td>
<td>The State uses data to support implementation of strategies that are most closely aligned to improved outcomes.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**
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.

**Examples of Evidence**

- 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/PD 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 to ensure protection of personally identifiable data
- 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 regularly communicate about outcomes data issues
- 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 longitudinal data systems are analyzed and used for improving the programs

---

*Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IF A STATE HAS</strong></th>
<th><strong>THEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>THEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>THEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>INTENDED OUTCOME</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The State will work with LEA/EIS programs to address needed improvement, in those areas that are most closely related to improved outcomes.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITION**
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.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**
- 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

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**
- 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

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**
- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF A STATE HAS</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>THEN</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective implementation of policies and procedures</td>
<td>The State develops policies and procedures that are aligned with IDEA and other Federal requirements.</td>
<td>The State effectively implements its policies and procedures.</td>
<td>The State ensures that LEA/EIS programs are knowledgeable about the policies and procedures.</td>
<td>LEA/EIS programs effectively implement policies and procedures that ensure the provision of FAPE in the LRE and EIS.</td>
<td>Effective implementation of policies and procedures will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DEFINITION

Policies and procedures outline the goals, objectives, processes and statutory requirements of a Part B and Part C Program, that are implemented with fidelity.

## EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE

- **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**
- **Evidence of LEA/EIS program implementation of the State’s policies and procedures**
- **Evidence of systematic and periodic review of implementation of specific policies and procedures**
- **Evidence of periodic review of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures**
- **Evidence of dissemination of State policies and procedures**
- **Evidence of dissemination of State policies and procedures**
- **Evidence of State TA/PD related to implementation of policies and procedures to 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**
- **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**
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
Council Meeting Dates 2021-2022

• April 14, 2022 Virtual or In-person to be determined
Keep The Main Thing The Main Thing
Closing Comments/Adjournment

• Next SEAC Meeting: April 14, 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) 296-6066  
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.