

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MINUTES



Details

Date November 20, 2024

Time 9 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Location:

Landon State Office Building

900 SW Jackson St

Topeka KS 66612

Zoom

Call to Order: at 9:02 a.m.

Roll Call

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

X	Autumn Biltz	Z	Jennifer Kucinski		Chris Reffett
	Sydney Dringman		Jennifer Kurth		Sabrina Rishel
X	Jennifer Florez	X	Dr. Jessica Lopez	Z	Rebecca Shultz
	Brandon Gay	X	Dr. Marvin Miller	Z	Dr. Sean Smith
Z	Whitney George		Bradley Miller	Z	Roxanne Zillinger
X	Lindsey Graf	Z	Dr. Brooke Moore		
X	Rebekah Helget		Dr. Troy Pitsch		
X	Jennifer King		Charity Porter		
X	Dr. Lena Kisner				

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

Z	Luanne Barron	Z	Leslie Girard		Idalia Shuman
Z	Mike Burgess		Melanie Haas		
Z	Ashley Enz	X	Jon Harding		

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

	Steve Backman	X	Brian Dempsey	X	Cary Rogers
X	Trish Backman		Dr. Crista Grimwood		Dean Zajic
X	Joyce Broils	X	Bert Moore	Z	Doug Bodine
X	Stacy Clark	X	Alysha Nichols		

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

Guests: Jen and Allison, ASL Interpreters. Mary Gardner.

Quorum (12) met: yes, 15 (11 after lunch)

Call to Order

Lindsey Graf

Roll Call

Alysha Nichols

Approvals

Lindsey Graf

Agenda Approval: Nov 20, 2024

Motion to approve: Dr. Marvin Miller.

Second: Autumn Biltz

Discussion:

Add the November 20, 2024 agenda for approval on the Agenda

Action: Approved with correction

Minutes Approval: July 24, 2024

Motion to approve: Dr. Marvin Miller

Second: Jennifer King

Discussion: None

Action: Approved as is

Agenda Approval: Sept 25, 2024

Motion to approve: Dr. Marvin Miller

Second: Autumn Biltz

Discussion: None

Action: Approved as is

Minutes Approval: September 25, 2024

Motion to approve: Dr. Marvin Miller

Second: Dr. Jessica Lopez

Discussion: None

Action: Approved as is

Public Comments

Lindsey Graf

Part C to B Transitions

Brian Dempsey

Bert Moore

- Refers to the coordination of public awareness, child find, screening, referral, evaluation to ensure the smooth and effective transition of children as they move from early intervention services under Part C into Part B early childhood special education programs and services for the benefit of children and families.

- Part C lead agency: Kansas State Department of Health and Environment.
- Part B lead agency: Kansas State Department of Education.
 - Comments by Brian Dempsey: Part of OSEP's (Office of Special Education Programs) visit was to meet with focus groups which involved a couple of parent groups, and they received some feedback. Some parents did not find the Part C to Part B transition to be smooth, they thought it was rough. That their child was identified, and the communication was abrupt and not as smooth as it could be. For Part B, OSEP was clear to say that it was just a couple of parents, and they did not feel like it was widespread across the state. There was nothing systemic that they believed to be of concern. Indicator 12 is a specific Part C to B transition indicator that measures the timely evaluation and identification of children that are referred from Part C to Part B. That is one thing we do in the IDEA and Gifted file review, and we pull files from ages 3 to 21-years-old so that we can capture that Early Childhood transition. OSEP suggested adding a specific question or two relating to C to B transition in the file review. Internally, we will work together to identify a question or two and bring it back to SEAC in January or April. Part C and B staff meet internally every month to go over everything that is going on and included in that is anything that either side is hearing about the transition. Sometimes these are case specific.
 - Comments by Bert Moore: School districts in Kansas are separated into three cohorts. So, if you are an interlocal you could have some of your districts going through a file review process on any given year and the next year you might have different districts. If you are a standalone district, then once every three years there will be a file review done by KSDE. OSEP says you must review all LEAs once every six years at a minimum, and Kansas set up that we will do it every three years. This helps us see any trend data that may arise. One of the problems that we have been hearing about is the 90 day transition meeting that has to be held where the Part C provider and the Part B provider and the parent get together and discuss what the transition would look like as the child moves from an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) which is designed around the needs of the parent, to an Individual Education Plan (IEP). Once a student is identified in Part C they meet the definition of a student with a disability. This becomes important when districts say they have to screen the Part C students before evaluating them. The student is already identified. There are two options. The parent is given a prior written notice that says the student will not be evaluated and why, or the parent is provided a prior written notice that says the district will do the evaluation for Part C transition. You have 90 days then to get the child evaluated, have the IEP developed, and the IEP in place by the child's third birthday. OSEP was hearing from around the state that the Part B representative is not attending the required transition meetings, has led us to address this issue. Another issue that's happening is the Part C provider telling the Part B provider what they will do once the child transitions to Part B, and that is outside the scope of what Part C can do. We were aware these things were happening so we may get corrective action assigned to us as a result of that because they asked us if we were doing direct monitoring of Section 619, which is age 3 to 5 support and services. Indirectly we were through the evaluation process, but we had not defined it in our questions in the file review "Did the LEA representative attend the 90-day transition meeting" or did the parent feel like they were given information that allowed them to make a good decision on what was best for their child as the child was transitioning to Part B services. Talking with other states, if the Part C provider gets a

ding, then so does the Part B provider. Many states do Part B and Part C. In Kansas, it is not set up that way and the legislature will not change it at this time.

- Question from Mike Burgess: There is a lot of effort going on around EPSDT (Early Periodic Screening Diagnostic and Treatment) which is a subset of Medicaid. Under our Medicaid program, it has to provide anything that is needed to correct or ameliorate a child's condition, so often kids with disabilities should meet that qualification. We are trying to do a better job of educating everyone in this process about EPSDT and how powerful of a tool it can be. The legislature added \$52 million to fund the services for EPSDT this last year and that will be an ongoing thing. How does that factor into the services for both Part C and Part B? Is there an awareness there and are we referring folks or educating on EPSDT and what can we do to partner with everyone and help a smooth transition all the way through from referrals to CDDOs and other organizations.
 - Response from Bert Moore: From a Medicaid perspective, you can bill for evaluations. Part of the Medicaid reimbursement allows for school psychologists who are properly licensed, to be able to bill for an evaluation. We also have social workers and counselors that are allowed to be billing Medicaid as well if a service is listed on the IEP, or I'm assuming on the IFSP. From our perspective we are going to do the evaluation regardless of any other guidelines or rules, and what we do after is submit billing to Medicaid which they may or may not pay on. As far as this is concerned I do not know if this is more directly medical related where it's for medical billing for EPSDT or for child psychologists or for psychiatrists. I am not familiar enough with how Medicaid supports the EPSDT function as far as an evaluation because it is outside of the scope of what the school would be required to do. We are required to identify the disability in all the areas of need that a child may have once they are evaluated and found eligible for special education services through IDEA from birth to age 21. So we have that child accountability and that's what we implement at a school-based service and here within my agency and my department we do not have any direct connection to Medicaid. None. There is no employee that has Medicaid as part of their job description. Now Stacie Martin and I take a strong interest in it and so we've kept up in some of those rules but as far as Medicaid we are dependent upon KDHE to do what needs to be done and work with the school systems directly or through third-party billers or the public service consulting group who does a lot of the training around the state to provide for what is eligible for Medicaid billing and how do you support that through the codes and get reimbursed for it because we are supposed to be seeking reimbursement for any function that we ourselves provide that is reimbursable through Medicaid.
- Question from Mike Burgess: My question is probably slightly different than that. How EPSDT can be a tool to help ameliorate conditions of the student? It's another tool in the toolbox that we are not using enough. I am trying to figure out how can we raise awareness of that because while it may not be something the schools can bill for it's a tool for the parents to help meet their son or daughter's needs.
 - Response from Dr. Marvin Miller: I think this is interesting because I sat in on some of those phone calls with OSEP for the transition for Part C to Part B services and that actually came up several times because parents were talking and asking questions about why they are not getting from the school district different Medicaid information. I think it goes back to people who do not understand they are two different agencies, two different things. I think your question is good, how can we use

this as a tool to educate parents. I think that's something that's not inside the wheelhouse of the Department of Education but could be some joint statement brochure that is worked on together.

- Comment from Bert Moore: We will work with the leadership team and if they are in agreement we can add this as agenda item and lean heavily on you to bring us information that you could share with the group on EPSDT and what you would like to see as far as an initiative to provide for better outcomes for students based upon what EPSDT can provide.

OSEP Items of Concern

Brian Dempsey

Bert Moore

- Identification and Correction of Non-Compliance
 - Data Collection
 - Representativeness
 - Self-Assessment File Reviews
 - Ensuring Correction – sufficiency of data review
 - Part 619 Monitoring – beyond Indicator 12
 - Monitoring of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) – KSDE monitors all districts through cyclical monitoring
- Data
 - Ensure public reporting at LEA level, when required
 - Example: Indicator 4
 - Include Levels of Determination at LEA level
- Dispute Resolution
 - Mediation Agreement – Confidentiality and Staying of a Formal Complaint
 - Tracking – Due Process
 - Hearing Officer and Complaint Investigator Training
 - Procedure/Process Documents
 - Expediated Due Process – Resolution Session and extension of timeline
 - Question from Rebekah Helget: Why isn't ongoing training for hearing officers mandatory instead of voluntary?
 - Response from Brian Dempsey: Mark Ward has very in-depth initial training. They must also be approved by the Kansas Supreme Court. There are ongoing requirements for that for mediators and then attorneys have to have their CLEs as well. Many hearing officers go to the Tristate Law Conference and get their CLEs that way.
 - Comment by Bert Moore: When the hearing officer completes the report, and that report comes to our agency there are no less than three people that review it. So if we have any questions about the authenticity of the background of the attorney or how they're preparing that report we point that out as we review those. I review all of them, as does Brian and Mark. Crista receives them as well. We are looking for both the content, the flow, and the outcomes. Does it flow with what was in the evidence. OSEP's questions were "How do you know." How do you know they were conducting these hearings in an appropriate manner? It is in the evidence and what they support within that document, and we review it.

Mark and Brian will frequently recommend that they go back and look at certain areas to make sure they're aligned with regulations or that the corrective action that was clearly talked about in the document is being followed. These reports do not go out until they've been thoroughly reviewed by our department.

- Child Find
 - Discussion regarding ensuring GEI (General Education Interventions), MTSS (Multi-Tiered Structural Supports) or RTIs (Response to Intervention) do not delay child find obligations
 - Comment from Bert Moore: OSEP looks at it from the perspective of the parents first. How did the parent rights get delivered; how did they know they had an option to ask for an evaluation. Even if it's in the parent's rights, how did you know that the parent knew. So, it is an issue of making sure that parents are informed of their rights that they have the right to request. That is a hard question to answer because that is at the local level. For example, who tells the parent at the local level that "your child is in Tier Three right now and they're making progress but they're two years below their peers but we're not going to do an evaluation because they're making progress."
 - Comment from Lindsey Graf: For our district we do get a letter stating the child was pulled for groups, but it does not mention tier or MTSS. This kind of segways into something we have talked about for the future, the January meeting, and some of that is General Education collaboration. Top down. Because we are seeing it to Tier Three and beyond but there's this gap between how we can get better collaboration and information. We have quarterly meetings, monthly meetings, Greenbush meetings, we have all kinds of things in the special education world to keep us on the up and up of what's going on and at the state level we have superintendent meetings monthly and the theory is all the directors and superintendents are passing the information all the way down the system but that is not necessarily what happens so when does General Education administration, building level principals, ever really get this information?
 - Comment from Bert Moore: What I have told my team is I do not want to implement a lot of changes until I get the report, and we have a chance to look at it and verify if we agree or disagree and we have feedback to OSEP. Then when we have the final report that has any corrective action on it, that is going to be widespread. That is going to be Statewide. That is not going to be something that goes underground and not heard about again. The State Board will be hearing about it and that's where we get the opportunity to really hit populations with if it this comes up, then it's an area that we have to do corrective action which requires training and professional development that we will then widely get across the state.
 - Comment from Melanie Haas: I spend a lot of Thursday mornings with Greenbush, for instance, and so when you talk about reaching principals, I think that's a top-down approach. What are they getting from their superintendent, are they talking about it in their district, and I wonder are there disproportionate levels and numbers of complaints coming from rural versus urban, small versus large districts. There are probably some interesting numbers there but what message is coming from the superintendent to the principals and then how are we reaching those superintendents and I would love to see more presentations like this one in front of superintendents at the service centers because that may be a better way to reach

them. It's kind of like a marketing problem, how do you get in front of them with the information that they need to hear. I think they'll be responsive more so to hearing about the problems if you were providing a list on a monthly or quarterly basis these are the school districts that have had issues with these things, and these are the corrective actions that are being taken. They're going to pay attention to that.

- Next Steps
 - KSDE will continue to work with TA (Technical Assistance) Centers
 - OSEP DMS (Differentiated Monitoring and Supports) Monitoring Report: Due 120 days from closure of onsite visit

Virtual Programs

Brian Dempsey

Kelly Steele

- If a district that is in a cohort is affiliated with a virtual program, during file review they are having at least two to three files monitored of the virtual program.
- There are limited questions, but it is a starting point while we work with SEAC to look at virtual programs generally and get the feedback on what you'd like to see
 - Question from Bert Moore: Can we have a description of what we provide as far as special education services within virtual programs? Are we tied to everything that student is supposed to receive in the school-based program, or do we limit those?
 - Response from Dr. Lena Kisner: There has been an influx of enrollment in virtual schools and really, we have just fumbled our way through and not felt real confident in the services that are being provided and that students are getting. Some of the questions that we have had and are able to get some data through a data request, was just regarding the number of IEPs in virtual schools. Kelly informed me that we probably need to make another request. One of the things we discussed in a previous meeting was graduation rates in virtual schools and how that might compare to kids in brick-and-mortar, and that data is not current so that is something that we would need to submit a new data request for. But, from a local perspective, I can talk a little bit about what we do when families choose to enroll in virtual schools. We write a temporary service plan, trying to get through those first few months in the virtual setting. The reason we do that is so that the IEP for the brick-and-mortar stays intact for four to five weeks, that way if it becomes apparent for the family that it is not the right fit for the student, they can go back to the brick-and-mortar and the IEP is still in place. In our temporary service plan, we outline what accommodations we are able to use in a virtual setting, what services will look like in a virtual setting. We never say, "well you had social work in the brick-and-mortar and now you are virtual, so we are crossing that off." We say it may look different. Services may be delivered differently but what is the equivalent on a temporary service plan. We won't be providing a para in your home but what might specialized instruction and inclusive type support look like in the virtual setting. So, we look at the services and say what is the equivalent based on the student's goals, and it also depends on how that virtual school is structured. Some programs have a lot more live teaching, which might look different than some that are more self-paced online with check-ins. What we have found as we have continued to investigate virtual schools is no two are alike, kind of like if you've met one kid with

autism you know one kid with autism. If you've seen one virtual school, you've seen one virtual school. I think we are seeing more families interested in a different model and this also bridges to that discussion regarding micro-schools because now we have a district starting micro-schools, we have districts partnering with micro-schools. There are micro-schools enrolling under virtual schools and what does that look like. It is when kids are actually going to a place and not just staying in their home to do their work. How does it work with things like ESI (emergency safety interventions) regulations and accommodations? After the pandemic, all of these things exploded and left us we didn't have enough information to answer the questions, and we had a general sense of angst across the state in the field on both sides, general education and special education. We want to keep the families, we can do some services virtually, but we are no longer doing remote learning, and we have families saying for a variety of reasons that brick-and-mortar buildings are just not working for them anymore. We are still investigating all of this. In addition, with this huge influx, the accountability and reporting pieces that we are used to in brick-and-mortar buildings were not happening on the same level of intensity. There seemed to be more questions than we had answers, so this has been an ongoing topic for SEAC as we investigate these ideas.

- Comment from Brian Dempsey: Virtual schools have to be affiliated, under Kansas law, with a district. So, they must be part of a school and there is no exception under IDEA or state law that gets you out of compliance from a special education perspective. So, the accountability is still there. Kelly is working on getting some updated data. At first it was seen that the virtual schools had pretty low graduation rates and it was affecting the rates of the brick-and-mortar side, so we have begun to disaggregate brick-and-mortar graduates from virtual graduates. An assistant director, Dr David Fernkopf, had worked on developing criteria for virtual schools, he is no longer here. Dr Robin Kelso has taken over. They worked really well to get some requirements and regulations in place for virtual schools to comply so that is set in stone. We have a FAQ (frequently asked questions) document; I am happy to send it to Lindsey to disseminate on virtual schools. What Lena talked about, one of the most frequent questions is who decides for the student to go to the virtual school and most of the time it's the parent. The IEP team, which includes the parent, can determine that, but after the pandemic some parents are just trying to look for a different option. Our FAQ recommends that you develop a services plan and put it in a PWN (prior written notice) place and leave the underlying IEP in place and see what happens. You have to address services, they may look different, but that doesn't get you out of them unless it's an IEP team decision and the parent consents if it's a material change. So, all of that stays in place.
- Question from Lindsey Graf: With the increase of people getting into virtual programs, have we seen an overall impact post-pandemic on State graduation rate?
 - Answer from Brian Dempsey: For special education no, it's been pretty flat. It dipped about a tenth or point five from last federal fiscal year to this reporting period. We are pretty close to our target.
 - Answer from Julie Ewing: For general education the graduation rate was up just a little.
 - Comment from Brian Dempsey: The accountability stays with the LEA (local education agency), it does not shift when there are different models. Some virtual

schools are big enough to provide their own special education. The accountability and responsibility stays with the LEA or if you are a co-op, it stays with the director. There is a conference in February in Andover, the Digital Learning Conference and KSDE has a panel.

- Question from Bert Moore: What other questions or information would you like to have regarding virtual education? We will bring data on who is providing it, graduation data, and put together a few things.
 - Comment from Autumn Biltz: I would be curious about, as you're researching different programs, if you find one that is actually doing a good job implementing support, it would be neat to have the data of what they're doing and how they're doing it to share with people who are struggling.
 - Comment from Lindsey Graf: Schools are getting very creative in supporting students, but the lines are getting very blurred between the brick and mortar to remote learning even though we don't have an established virtual program in our district. From a special education standpoint, how am I ensuring that ethically the school is following the rules of our state set forth by like no remote learning and providing services in that model. That is something locally that has to be monitored but I appreciate any thinking outside the box. There is a very gray line starting to happen in such creativity that we are doing remote or virtual but not having those programs.
 - Response from Brian Dempsey: There is a lot of out of the box thinking in discipline as well, and while we're not suspending them, we're putting them in home time out or trying to call it something different. But OSEP's very clear, and I think this is similar, if it meets the criteria, it is this "x."
 - Comment from Bert Moore: Our legislators promote it and like it, so it is not going to go away. So, we have to think in terms of how can we make the best benefit for our students with disabilities so they can be successful in that environment.
- Question from Whitney George: Do homeschool and virtual school students take state assessments
 - Answer from Julie Ewing: Virtual school students have the opportunity to take state assessments at the brick-and-mortar school or as of last year they have the option to take it in a remote setting. Before, virtual school students were required to come into the brick-and-mortar school for assessments at a scheduled time. We do not have a very high participation rate, but they are required. Homeschool students do not take state assessments.
- Question from Dr. Lena Kisner: Is it possible to get that information and outcomes on graduation?
 - Response from Bert Moore: We could probably look at aggregate numbers but because there may be small numbers we may not be able to see by agency.
 - Comment from Julie Ewing: I would just like to clarify. Virtual programs are programs that a service center has. A virtual school is connected to a school district and has a building number. We have a lot of different language and that is just a distinction as we talk about it. We should be aware of that
- Question from Dr. Lena Kisner: So, how do we know which districts are working with virtual programs through service centers and which students are enrolled if there is no building number?
 - Response from Julie Ewing: We have that online and we can get that information. If

there are schools that participate in a service center's virtual programs, that information is reported in some way on the September 20th enrollment data, it will somehow note that the student is in a virtual program.

KIAS Stakeholders

Lindsey Graf

- Indicator 18
 - Will be reviewed later today
- Statewide IEP Update
 - IT says they can do it
 - Next step is sending out for Requests for Information (RFI's)
 - RFI's are a formal document that KSDE use to gather information from IEP vendors or providers
- District Level of Determination
 - Reviewing the rewards and sanctions to see if still working to incentivize
 - Annual Performance Report guide being updated
- Monitoring
 - Virtual Schools are being monitored, specifically ensuring that files are pulled that have students enrolled in the virtual school
 - Discussed IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act) and Gifted File review process and procedures
 - Discussed the Adult Jails and Correctional facilities Monitoring
- Transition
 - Discussed various transition initiatives and programs throughout the state
 - Some pilot programs are starting transition at age 12 (not a requirement)
- Professional Development (PD)
 - Overview of PD opportunities for directors and staff
 - Discussed PD opportunities for General Education administrators, especially at building level
- Next Meeting is April 24, 2025

SPP/APR 2023, Ind 1-17 & Ind 18

Brian Dempsey

- State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators
 - Indicator 1: Graduation
 - Indicator 2: Drop Out
 - Indicator 3A: Participation for Students with Individual Education Plans (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 to age 21)

- Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
- Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement
- Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
- Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
- Indicator 11: Child Find
- Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
- Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
- Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
- Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
- Indicator 16: Mediation
- Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
- Indicator 18: General Supervision
- Kansas Performance on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023 SPP/APR
 - Indicator 1: Graduation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
 - Indicator 2: Drop Out
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 21
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
 - Indicator 3A: Participation for Students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
 - Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
 - Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
 - Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement

Standards)

- Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Met Target
- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
- Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 22
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
- Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 22
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
- Indicator 5: Education Environments (5-year-old kindergarteners to age 21)
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 19
 - Met Target for 5A, 5B, and 5C
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage for 5A, 5B, and 5C
- Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 19 for 6A and 6B
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20 for 6C
 - Met All Targets
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 08
 - Met Target for 7B2
 - Did Not Meet Target for 7A, 7B1, or 7C
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Slippage for 7A, 7B1, and 7C
- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 21
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Compliance Indicator

- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Compliance Indicator
- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 11: Child Find
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 05
 - Compliance Indicator
 - Did Not Meet Target
- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 05
 - Compliance Indicator
- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 09
 - Compliance Indicator
 - Did not Meet Target
- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 09
 - Met Target for 14A and 14B
 - Did Not Meet Target for 14C
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No Slippage
- Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 05
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 16: Mediation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 13
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?

- Baseline Year: FFY 21
 - Did Not Meet Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 18: General Supervision
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 23
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- OSEP (Office of Special Education Programs) Required Actions: Compliance Indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13):
 - Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.
 - In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.
- OSEP Required Actions: Indicator 10
 - Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the two districts identified in FFY 2022 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.
 - If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.
 - Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining district identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in

- FFY 2022 and the one district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
- OSEP Required Actions: Indicator 8
 - In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.
 - OSEP Required Actions: Indicator 14
 - In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Assessment Results

Julie Ewing

- Testing Window 2023-2024
 - General Assessments: ELA (English Language Arts), Math and Science
 - March 18 – April 19 (In-person testing)
 - April 22 – May 3 (Remote testing for virtual students)
 - Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM): ELA, Math and Science*
 - Fall Window – 9/11/2023 – 12/26/2023
 - Spring Window* - 02/05/2024 – 04/26/2024
- General Summative Assessments
 - Subject: Math
 - Grades
 - 3-8
 - 10
 - Estimated time to Complete (untimed)
 - Two Sessions
 - 45-60 minutes each
 - Subject: ELA
 - Grades
 - 3-8
 - 10
 - Estimated time to Complete (untimed)
 - Two Sessions
 - 45-60 minutes each

- Subject: Science
 - Grades
 - 5
 - 8
 - 11
 - Estimated time to Complete (untimed)
 - Two Sessions
 - 45-60 minutes each
- Current Performance Level Descriptors
 - Level 1: A student at Level 1 shows a limited ability to understand and use the skills and knowledge needed for postsecondary readiness.
 - Level 2: A student at Level 2 shows a basic ability to understand and use the skills and knowledge needed for postsecondary readiness.
 - Level 3: A student at Level 3 shows an effective ability to understand and use the skills and knowledge needed for postsecondary readiness.
 - They are going to ask the Board to change the word 'effective; to use the word 'proficient.'
 - Level 4: A student at Level 4 shows an excellent ability to understand and use the skills and knowledge needed for postsecondary readiness.
 - Comment from Lindsey Graf: There is conversation in the field that level two, under current language, is at grade level. And that by changing Level 3 to be 'proficient' that it's at more grade level
 - Response from Julie Ewing: It is all at grade level. At Level 2 students have a basic understanding of grade level material.
 - Comment from Lindsey Graf: I think as a state we have shifted to where we want kids at a Level 3, but the common is two is a basic understanding of what they are supposed to know. So that is the nice part about the word 'proficient' it's a bit higher than basic.
- Math All Students vs Students with Disabilities
 - 2024 All Students
 - Level 1: 33.24%
 - Level 2: 35.14%
 - Level 3: 21.27%
 - Level 4: 10.33%
 - 2024 Special Education Students
 - Level 1: 61.98%
 - Level 2: 25.66%
 - Level 3: 8.29%
 - Level 4: 4.05%
- Math Students with Disabilities
 - 2023
 - Level 1: 62.29%
 - Level 2: 25.84%
 - Level 3: 8.14%
 - Level 4: 3.71%
 - 2024
 - Level 1: 61.98%

- Level 2: 25.66%
 - Level 3: 8.29%
 - Level 4: 4.05%
- ELA All Students vs Students with Disabilities
 - 2024 All Students
 - Level 1: 32.77%
 - Level 2: 33.67%
 - Level 3: 25.28%
 - Level 4: 8.27%
 - 2024 Special Education Students
 - Level 1: 63.62%
 - Level 2: 23.59%
 - Level 3: 9.84%
 - Level 4: 2.93%
- ELA Students with Disabilities
 - 2023
 - Level 1: 64.01%
 - Level 2: 23.72%
 - Level 3: 9.5%
 - Level 4: 2.74%
 - 2024
 - Level 1: 63.62%
 - Level 2: 23.59%
 - Level 3: 9.84%
 - Level 4: 2.93%
- Science All Students vs Students with Disabilities
 - 2024 All Students
 - Level 1: 39.72%
 - Level 2: 27.98%
 - Level 3: 19.72%
 - Level 4: 12.56%
 - 2024 Special Education Students
 - Level 1: 64.49%
 - Level 2: 20.86%
 - Level 3: 9.31%
 - Level 4: 5.31%
- Science Students with Disabilities
 - 2023
 - Level 1: 66.21%
 - Level 2: 20.54%
 - Level 3: 8.71%
 - Level 4: 4.52%
 - 2024
 - Level 1: 64.49%
 - Level 2: 20.86%
 - Level 3: 9.31%
 - Level 4: 5.31%

Indicator 8 – Get parents more involved. Stakeholder Feedback

Brian Dempsey

- Response rate has been declining
 - We don't include giftedness; parents might like to provide feedback on that
- Indicator 8 Current Survey Question
 - "Did the school district invite you to take part in discussions for improving services and results for your child?"
- Possible Topic Areas
 - Parent Rights/Procedural Safeguards
 - Parent Involvement and Participation
 - Training and Information
 - Communication
- Comment from Kerry Haag: one thing that we can ask, is for the evaluation team to present an analysis of the family engagement survey data. About 15,000 parents take that survey every year. There's a place where they can identify whether or not the student has an IEP, race, ethnicities, languages they speak in their home, and do they qualify for free or reduced lunch. We could ask them to bring an analysis of what the data looks like to this group. It's about 15-20 questions. There is not a question about did you receive your parental rights or procedural safeguards.
- Comment from Lindsey Graf: I am also curious what other states participation rates are like.
 - Response from Brian Dempsey: The other states are just as low as ours, this is just the first year they are rolling theirs out, so they don't have their data yet.
- Question from Dr Jessica Lopez: Is the goal of changing the survey from the one question to however many it is, to get more parents to take it so that we can get more accurate data on their involvement?
 - Response from Bert Moore: What does the question tell you when you read it.
 - In room responses
 - That they invite you to the meeting;
 - That they asked your opinion in the meeting;
 - Did I get what I wanted for my child;
 - Who was involved (who facilitated);
 - Did I feel heard, and my requests incorporated into the IEP;
 - I was happy with what happened (what if I wasn't?);
 - Was I in the room and signed the papers.
 - Comment from Lindsey Graf: The bigger question is the lay person parent has got to understand and be able to interpret the question and if we are sitting here going 'I think it means this' 'it could mean this' they're not going to understand it. We've lost it. If they did click on the survey, they've just clicked back out.
 - Comment from Dr. Jessica Lopez: I think you will have the same issue if you go from one question to 11 questions.
 - Comment from Dr. Lena Kisner: If we had a better question, a better survey, I think it would be easier as administrators to explain it to our providers who could then explain it to the family and help with the response rate. I can't explain this to my teachers when we don't know what it's asking.

- Comment from Bert Moore: Let us work on it and come up with some alternatives to bring back in January.

September Site Visit Discussion

Membership

- Comment from Dr. Lena Kisner: I was really just amazed. I had no idea what to expect at the state schools. It was remarkable to see the campuses and to see students around. To see the work, they're doing and the ideas they have for moving forward. If you haven't visited the state schools, please make a point to visit them. I've never had an opportunity to have students at the state schools that I placed, we had one that moved in. I would have full confidence in the work that both the state schools do, and it was a remarkable opportunity and I appreciate Jon and Luann for those visits.
- Comment from Lindsey Graf: I had been to the Kansas State School for the Deaf one time for an IEP meeting and got to see a classroom with kids. So, this was awesome to see everything else. It was so impressive. I love history and the history of the building and some of the stuff on campus was absolutely amazing. I didn't know there was a pool at the State School for the Blind. To see the dorms and where they live, it was awesome to see. I can't experience what it is like for them, but I have a much better picture now.
- Comment from Autumn Biltz: I had to stay a little after the visit wrapped up at the School for the Blind, and while I was there the coffee shop opened up and I was able to buy some of the coffee beans and interact with some of the students and paras there. It was a great experience just watching how they ran the coffee shop and how they did it all, and experienced and supported them with that.
- Comment from Jon Harding: Thank you for coming and having a meeting at our campus. We appreciate that. We see ourselves as an extension of public schools really. We do want people to know what we do and be very transparent about that. We are not perfect by any means but the more that we share and communicate, and you know, lower the gates if you will. I think that's beneficial for everyone.
- Comment from Dr. Brooke Moore: Thanks again to Luann and John for the fantastic tours but also thank you to Bert for coordinating this because I don't think we as SEAC members get to do field trips very often, so it was an incredible experience, so than you to you and your team for organizing that.
- Comment from Bert Moore: We're here to serve you.

Ex-Officio Member Reports

Families Together

Lesli Girard

SEAC Report July-September 2024

- 2,355 individualized consultations
 - Ethnicity Breakdown
 - African American - 7%
 - Asian - 2%
 - Caucasian - 67%
 - Hispanic - 10%

- Native American - 0%
- Two or more Races - 1%
- Not Determined/Other - 13%
- Age of child/youth
 - Birth through age 2 – 2%
 - 3 to 5 – 16%
 - 6 to 13 – 40%
 - 14 to 18 – 38%
 - 19 to 21 – 2%
 - 22 and over – 2%
- Primary Disability
 - Autism – 477
 - Suspected Disability – 247
 - No IDEA – 158
 - Specific Learning Disability – 141
 - Other Health Impairment – 133
 - Emotional Disability – 127
 - Developmental Delay – 93
 - Intellectual Disability – 78
 - Speech or Learning Disability – 56
 - Multiple Disabilities – 36
 - Hard of Hearing – 12
 - Orthopedic Disability – 10
 - Gifted – 12
 - Traumatic Brain Injury – 5
 - Visual Disability – 4
 - Deaf/Blindness – 0
- By Contact Content (Top 20)
 - 554 – Family Support
 - 534 – Families Together Info
 - 393 – Community Services
 - 391 – IEP
 - 213 – Family Engagement
 - 132 – Behavior/BIP/FBA
 - 130 – Education Advocate
 - 128 – Parent Involvement
 - 120 – Parenting Information
 - 118 – Parent Rights
 - 99 – Comprehensive Evaluation
 - 93 – Extra Curricular Activities
 - 89 – Section 504
 - 89 – Records
 - 85 – Accommodations/Modifications
 - 83 – Mental Health
 - 70 – Child in Need of Care (CINC)
 - 65 – Transition to Adulthood
 - 58 – Family and School Partner

- 57 – Person Centered Planning
- By Contact Content – Others
 - 51 – School Issues
 - 50 – Program/Placement Options
 - 53 – School Health
 - 37 – HCBS Waiver
 - 34 – Self Advocacy
 - 48 – Suspension
 - 28 – Disability
 - 28 – Collaboration
 - 29 – JJA
 - 24 – Related Services
 - 24 – Circle of Friends
 - 24 – Court System
 - 23 – Bullying
 - 23 – Guardianship/Alternatives
 - 24 – Attendance
 - 21 – MDR
 - 20 – Truancy
 - 22 – Early Childhood
- CHASE Your Dreams Podcast
 - Community out of Necessity – Meet Jackie Nguyen
 - Jackie Nguyen, California-native that moved to Kansas City and opened KC's first ever Vietnamese Coffee Shop.
 - Watch the discussion about diverse communities
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RefyGhMcxhY>
- Education Advocate
 - Month: July 2024
 - Appointments 32; New Appointments 12
 - Cancellations 35; Final Cancellations 16
 - Total Processed: 48
 - Early Childhood Appointments: 4
 - Month: August 2024
 - Appointments 125; New Appointments 63
 - Cancellations 117; Final Cancellations 56
 - Total Processed: 181
 - Early Childhood Appointments: 24
 - Month: September 2024
 - Appointments 121; New Appointments 46
 - Cancellations 78; Final Cancellations 42
 - Total Processed: 163
 - Early Childhood Appointments: 12

Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators

Ashley Enz

- Approximately 200 members represent 286 Kansas school districts.
- KASEA is currently accepting nominations for scholarships and awards. KASEA

members are eligible to nominate for awards and scholarship recipients must be sponsored by a KASEA member.

- Scholarships: For participating professionals who are furthering their education in special education or to undergraduate students who are preparing for a career in special education.
- Awards: Special Education Administrator of the Year; Special Education Professional of the Year.
- KASEA and Friends
 - Connecting with KASEA
 - November 21, 2024 from 12pm to 1pm
 - Quarterly Zoom calls with colleagues to explore KASEA.
 - SpEd and Building Leader meetings– USA Kansas Partnership;
 - KASEA Winter Conference;
 - January 30-31, 2025, in Wichita KS,
 - Registration opens early December,
 - Membership meeting and social takes place on January 29.

Disability Rights Center

Mike Burgess

- Analysis of the waiting list for the IDD/PD waiver
 - If we continue to meet the needs of individuals, they may not want or need to move onto the waiver.
 - Things that help meet the needs of individuals with disabilities:
 - Doing EPSDT well;
 - Continuing to add capacity to the waiver;
 - Added 500 slots to waiver waiting list,
 - More than 800 people have come off the waiting list,
 - Acceptance onto waiting list is not 100%,
 - Cannot locate individuals,
 - How long they've been on the list.
 - Roll out community supports waiver and have capacity of around 1500 individuals;
 - Rethinking how we manage the waiting list and move to active management of the waiting list.
 - Some states, such as Virginia, take into account when someone will need services. For example, they ask do you need services;
 - Now
 - Next twelve months
 - 1 to five years
 - Five+ years
 - Child find would be a great way to identify individuals and put them on the Five+ list.
 - This would help us understand the scope of services someone might need and ideally even project future needs so we can as a state pass a budget and be able to plan for that.
- For the last four years the Judicial Council has convened a Guardianship and Conservatorship Advisory Committee;
 - Working to overhaul Kansas' guardianship laws,

- Last done in 2002,
- Based on uniform code,
- Will include modern concepts including alternatives to guardianship,
- Increasing or solidifying safeguards,
- Kansas currently has above-average numbers of guardianships.

Kansas State Board of Education

Melanie Haas

- State Board meets every month, last week was the meeting for November;
- In October KSDE hosted the Great Ideas Conference;
 - It is a great opportunity for Board members to sit in on some of the sessions and hear the different topics and talk to teachers and administrators,
 - Conference is moving from October to July.
 - There will be three new board members at the January meeting;
- The Blue-Ribbon Taskforce on Screentime has wrapped up;
 - 8-10 weeks of weekly Zoom meetings,
 - 36 members including students, parents, teachers, administrators, board, members, industry experts such as IT professionals
 - Purpose: What are the best practices that the State Board and KSDE need to be offering districts to support them as they are making decisions around policies regarding either personal devices or school issued devices,
 - State Board generally avoids mandates, this is going to be a document that would provide guidance to local districts,
 - Recommendation from the Taskforce is all districts have students K-12 put their devices away, and teachers too.
- Legislative priorities
 - KSDE.org/Board is a great place to go to catch up or keep track of what the Board is doing;
 - There is a map that shows all ten State Board of Education district boundaries,
 - Our wonderful Executive Administrative Assistant takes great notes during the meetings, and these include voting results. These are on this webpage as well.
 - Broken down to four areas
 - Academic Support
 - Health and Safety
 - Funding
 - Education Policy Governance
 - Current priorities
 - Success of the Foster Child report card
 - Opioid crisis
 - Farm to Plate
 - Safe and Secure Schools
 - High quality childcare
 - Special Education excess cost funding at 92% is at the top of the list
- Presentations from this month's Board meeting if you would like to go back to look at them included;
 - KMEA
 - Blueprint for Literacy and Science of Reading

- KSSHA
- Commissioner Watson made a trip to the Pentagon to ask about receiving information on post-secondary enlistment numbers in Kansas so that they can be added to the post-secondary outcomes list,
- If you make a presentation at the State Board that includes data please consider discussing where does the data come from, what all does it entail, and how much do we have access to.

Kansas State School for the Blind

Jon Harding

- Licensed for an inclusive childcare center for students aged 6 weeks to 6-years-old;
- Extended school year program that will switch from a three-week program to 2 two-week sessions;
- Vision Symposium is a professional development for vision teachers, orientation mobility specialists, early childhood, and some administrators;
 - 165 in attendance in Wichita at the Drury Inn,
 - For future conferences we are trying to partner with the Kansas Optometric Association because they do an education conference the day before in Wichita.
- Hosted a “Make 48” competition
 - Regional competition with six schools for the blind hosted at KSSB earlier in the fall,
 - Aired on Wednesday at 8pm on Roku’s This Old House Makers Channel.
- There’s a cohort of special schools going through KESA; Lake Mary, KSSB, KSSD, Lawerence-Gardner High school and Heartspring;
 - Meeting with Dr Jay Scott and Myron Melton about outcomes to measure such as transition and academic outcomes
- You can purchase Brailled Bean Coffee on the KSSB store
<https://kssb.net/kssb-makerspace-shop/>

Items for January SEAC Agenda

Members

- January 14, 2025
 - Bishop Professional Development Center
3601 SW 31st ST, Topeka KS 66614
 - Meeting from 9am to 3:30pm
 - SICC will be in attendance
- January 15, 2025
 - Landon State Office Building
900 SW Jackson ST, Topeka KS 66612
Room 509
- Breakfast with the Board
 - Building entry will be permitted at 7:30am; Breakfast available by 8am
 - Meeting 9am to 3:30pm
- If you have an idea for what you would like a topic to be please email Lindsey Graf and it will be discussed by SEAC Leadership

Meeting adjourned: at 1:44pm

SEAC Minutes November 20, 2024

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.