

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MINUTES



Details

Date January 14, 2025

Time 9 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Location:

Bishop Professional Development Center

3601 SW 31st Street

Topeka Kansas 66614

Zoom

Call to Order: at 9:11 a.m.,

Roll Call

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

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

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

	Luanne Barron	X	Leslie Girard		Idalia Shuman
	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		Cary Rogers
	Trish Backman		Dr. Crista Grimwood	X	Dean Zajic
X	Joyce Broils	X	Bert Moore	X	Melissa Valenza
X	Stacy Clark	X	Alysha Nichols		

Guests: Jen and Allison, ASL Interpreters. SICC Members: Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer, Lisa Collette, Christy Wyckoff, Tricia Waggoner, Nichelle Adams, Chanda Gross, Rebecca Bell, Diana Martinez, Bronwyn Fees, Susan Bowles, Ann Elliott, Erin Schuweiler, Monica Ross, Marites Altuna, Courtney Hochman, Elizabeth Brunscheen-Cartagena, and Tiffany Bartley. Heather Gould and

Quorum (12) met: yes, 15

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

Call to Order

Lindsey Graf

Roll Call

Alysha Nichols

Approvals

Lindsey Graf

Agenda Approval: January 14, 2025

Motion to approve: Autumn Biltz.

Second: Dr. Lena Kisner

Discussion: Add SICC Strategic Plan Goals to agenda at approximately 930

Action: Approved with addition

Minutes Approval: November 20, 2024

Motion to approve: Autumn Biltz

Second: Dr Lena Kisner

Discussion: None

Action: Approved as is

Public Comments

Lindsey Graf

None

SICC Agenda

Agenda Approval: January 14, 2025

Motion to approve: Susan Bowles

Second: Ann Elliott

Discussion: None

Action: Approved

SICC Minutes

Minutes Approval: November 20, 2024

Motion to approve: Courtney Hochman

Second: Ann Elliott

Discussion: None

Action: Approved

Introductions of State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and SEAC Members

- Lindsey Graf, SEAC – Special Education Director in Coffey County, SEAC Chair
- Dr Lena Kisner, SEAC – Special Education Director at the Reno County Education Co-Op. Chair elect for SEAC and fills the role of special education administrator on SEAC. President of Kansas Association of Special Education Administrators
- Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer, SICC- Special Education Director at the Northwest Kansas Educational Service Center. Coordinator for Early Childhood Coordinating Council, EC3,

which is the infant toddler services program in Northwest Kansas. SICC Chair

- Jennifer Kucinski, SEAC- Kansas State School for the Deaf. Represents state agencies that provide related services
- Bert Moore, SEAC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. State Director of Special Education and Title Services. Secretary of SEAC
- Stacy Clark, SICC/SEAC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. SICC coordinator at KSDE
- Alysha Nichols, SEAC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. Assistant support to SEAC
- Erin Schuweiler, SICC- Kansas School for the Deaf in the Sound Start Birth to Three program and support the language assessment program which serves children, deaf and hard of hearing ages birth to age eight. Serves as a provided member on SICC
- Susan Bowles, SICC- Speech language pathologist from Hays, Kansas, working with children birth through age five. Works with KidLink in seven counties in north central Kansas. Fills the provider vendor membership on SICC
- Rebecca Bell, SICC- Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services employee, in attendance for Gary Hinault
- Ann Elliott, SICC- Executive Director of the Family Resource Center in Pittsburg, Kansas. It is a childcare preschool facility licensed for 362 kids. Provider member on SICC
- Autumn Biltz, SEAC- Representative with a disability. Works as a middle school special education teacher in Dodge City, Kansas
- Courtney Hochman, SICC- Parent member of SICC from Manhattan, Kansas
- Jon Harding, SEAC- Ex-officio member of SEAC. Superintendent of the Kansas State School for the Blind in Kansas City, Kansas
- Chanda Gross, SICC- Kansas Department of Health and Environment employee. Works with healthcare finance
- Christy Wyckoff, SICC- Children's Cabinet
- Leslie Girard, SEAC/SICC- Ex-officio member of SICC and SEAC. Representative for Families Together, the parent training information center for Kansas State Department of Education
- Tricia Waggoner, SICC- Part C Coordinator for State of Kansas. Kansas Department of Health and Environment employee. KDHE representative on SICC
- Lisa Colette, SICC- Vice Chair for SICC. Represents the insurance commissioner for the Department of Insurance. Family engagement coordinator for the Deaf Blind Project
- Bronwyn Fees, SICC- Associate Dean and professor at Kansas State University, College of Health and Human Services. Serves as the Kansas Board of Regents representative to SICC
- Sydney Dringman, SICC/SEAC- Deputy Director of Permanency with the Kansas Department of Children and Families. Represents child welfare agency and foster care on both SICC and SEAC
- Rebecca Schultz, SEAC- Retired special education teacher. Represents a person with a disability on SEAC
- Melissa Valenza, SICC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. KSDE representative on SICC
- Brian Dempsey, SEAC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. Assistant Director on Special Education and Title Services team
- Dean Zajic, SEAC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. Assistant Director

on Special Education and Title Services team

- Jennifer Florez, SEAC- Special education teacher with Shawnee Mission school district
- Dr. Brooke Moore, SEAC- Faculty member at Fort Hays State University. Representative of higher education institutions
- Marites Altuna, SICC- Director of Family Infant Toddler Services at the Kansas State School for the Blind. Provider member of SICC
- Whitney George, SEAC- General education teacher in Manhattan. Moving to special education teacher next year
- Nichelle Adams, SICC- Kansas Department of Children and Families childcare representative on SICC. The CCDF co-administrator for the State of Kansas
- Jennifer King, SEAC/SICC- Early childhood coordinator for Wichita Public Schools. Represents the role of a parent of a student with gifted services on SEAC. Also is the SEAC representative on SICC
- Roxanne Zillinger, SEAC- Kansas State Department of Education employee. Fulfills role of a KSDE representative for homeless children and youth on SEAC
- Brandon Gay, SEAC- Program director for Colby Community College at Norton Correctional Facility. Represents correctional facilities
- Jennifer Kurth, SEAC- Professor at the University of Kansas and the department chair for the Department of Special Education at the University of Kansas. Represents higher education
- Monica Ross, SICC- Program Director for Infant Toddler Services in Johnson County. Provider representative on SICC
- Deanna Martinez, SICC- Head start representative from the Family Conservancy

SICC Strategic Report

Stacy Clark, SICC

- Most of our work is done in committees
- The mission of the Kansas (State) Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) on Early Childhood Developmental Services is to ensure that a comprehensive service delivery system of integrated services is available in Kansas to all children with, or at risk of, developmental delays from birth through age five and their families
- Strategic Planning in June 2024
- SICC Goals for 2024-2025
 - Goal 1: Medicaid
 - Review and utilize existing Medicaid research and data
 - Goal 2: Categorical Aid
 - Increase training and TA to programs on maximizing Categorical Aid. Research and review strategies to maximize categorical aid reimbursement to Part C and Section 619 programs
 - Goal 3: Inclusion
 - In Part C and Part B 619, assist and advice KDHE and KSDE on early childhood natural environments and Least Restrictive Environments (LRE) for children 0-5
 - Goal 4: Promote the management and function of the SICC as it aligns and compliments the All in for Kansas Kids strategic plan
 - Improve the availability of reliable resources and information for parents

- in a centralized location
 - Increase the availability of mental health resources for providers and caregivers
 - Improve the recruitment and retention of the local workforce by collaborating with others
 - Goal 5: Support LICCs (Local Interagency Coordinating Councils) to maximize their role of serving children in their communities
 - Offer relevant, professional learning opportunities through the Fall LICC Retreat
 - Increase effectiveness of LICC through surveys
- Medicaid Workgroup
 - Review and utilize existing Medicaid research and data
 - Lead: Lisa Collette: our previous goal was to research and review policies and strategies to maximize Medicaid reimbursement through Part C and Part B. However, we are going to review and utilize existing Medicaid research and data. We have partnered with KU with their CPPR as a stakeholder. They will be the ones really looking at this for us. We will take that report and look it over and go from there as far as what we feel like needs done for our State. Our hope is to look at the reimbursement codes that are out there, and whether or not they're open to Part C as well. For our Part C programs, that would be a game changer. There was a little bit of a halt in this research but we are supposed to be meeting back up with KU sometime this month, maybe into February, to kind of see what's going on and to see what they have found so far. We've also provided them with some of our own research and documents that we found from other States and what they have done in order to make sure that there was money to help provide intervention services as well. Like for SLP, OT or things like that for instance, New Mexico has done it to where their State legislature request their insurance departments or insurance companies to provide an amount of money into a pot that goes to help pay for some of these things
- Categorical Aid Workgroup
 - Increase training and TA to programs on maximizing Categorical Aid. Research and review strategies to maximize categorical aid reimbursement to Part C and Section 619 programs
 - Lead: Monica Ross: We are looking at other programs and looking at the Categorical Aid they are claiming, and then we are looking at the Categorical Aid they are eligible for. We have spent a lot of time reviewing previous testimonies as well that have been presented when we've talked about Part C funding. Our biggest question is surrounding are the Part C programs capturing all the Categorical Aid that they're eligible for, and we had a great meeting this month where Dean Zajic and Evelyn Alden of KSDE came and really explored what that piece looks like and how Part C coordinators can get access to reports on who is in their program and what that looks like for the district level billing
- Inclusion Committee
 - In Part C and Part B 619, assist and advise KDHE and KSDE on early childhood natural environments and Least Restrictive Environments (LRE) for children 0-5
 - Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: The lead for this committee is not here but I am on this one. The Inclusion in Part C and Part B committee has the goal to assist

and advise. She has KSDE and KDHE on early childhood LRE and inclusion practices and then some of the strategies that we are looking at as a committee. One of them is to really look at the Federal and State guidelines, so that our committee members really have a good understanding about what LRE is, what natural environments are, and how they can work together to improve on transitions, identifying best practices, to support inclusion and then explore resources across agencies and organizations. We are just getting started with that committee

- SICC Systems and Services Committee
 - Improve the availability of reliable resources and information for parents in a centralized location
 - Increase the availability of mental health resources for providers and caregivers
 - Improve the recruitment and retention of the local workforce by collaborating with others
 - Stacy Clark: The lead for this committee is not here today, but they have really been digging into the All in for Kansas Kids strategic plan and trying to hone in on what specific goal they're going to have for an action plan.
- LICC Support Committee
 - Offer relevant, professional learning opportunities through the Fall LICC Retreat
 - Increase effectiveness of LICC through surveys
 - Lead: Kathy Kersenbrock-Ostmeyer: I am the chair of the LICC Support Committee. We are here to support the local interagency coordinating councils. And so some of the things that we are looking at are ways to help those LICCs in having parent members, which is one of our goals that our State and our local 8 committees have. And then also we do provide every year a training to support not only the providers with getting continuing education units, but also to look at the childcare providers and preschool teachers to try and provide an easy way to get access and learning, and we have a fall retreat every year. It is online and usually we have two or three topics. It has been really well attended the last few years. We are looking at topics for our next retreat which will be November 7, 2025. We meet once a month on Thursdays, remotely. If anyone on the committee would like to join you are more than welcome. We love all sorts of ideas. We meet on the second Thursday of the month, remotely at 3:45pm. Just reach out to myself, Susan Bowles or Stacy Clark

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Federal Fiscal Year 2023

Tricia Waggoner, SICC

- Reported dates July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024
 - Also known as Federal Fiscal year (FFY) 2023 and State Fiscal year 2024
- Kansas Early Childhood Development Services (KECDS) served 11,610 children in the reporting period (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)
 - What we are called at the state office (KECDS)
 - There are 29 individual infant toddler programs across the state that service children 0 to age 3
- KECDS updated its baseline year to FFY 2021, new targets are in effect for the FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024). This is the first-year reporting with these new targets

- KECDs' General Supervision System includes Determinations, Semi-Annual Reports, Random Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) Reviews, and Fiscal Audit Reviews
- The Kansas Inservice Training System provides Technical Assistance to KECDs
- KECDs makes information available to the public on its website
 - <https://www.kdhe.ks.gov/677>
- Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services
 - Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments
 - Compliance Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who are receiving the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)
 - Compliance Indicators are required to be set at 100%
 - The Kansas' definition of timely receipt of services is that services will be provided within 30 days from the parent consent to IFSP services
 - 5583 Children with IFSPs all with timely Provision of Services
 - FFY 2023 Target: 100%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 100%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - The definition of slippage is a worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target. The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:
 - For "large" percentages, it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example: It is not slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY2022 data were 32.9% (32% is below target). It is slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator X is 32% and the FFY2022 data was 33.1%
 - For "small" percentages, it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example: It is not slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator Y is 5% and the FFY2022 data was 5.1% (5% is below target). It is slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator Y is 4.9% and the FFY2022 data was 5.1%
- Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments
 - Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments
 - Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)
 - FFY 2023 Target: 95.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.86%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes
 - Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments
 - Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:
 - A- Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)
 - B- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

- C- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
 - Indicator 3A: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)
 - A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2023 Target: 64.63%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 68.28%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2023 Target: 54.97%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 56.09%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - Indicator 3B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)
 - B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2023 Target: 69.19%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 69.82%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2023 Target: 53.50%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 53.56%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - Indicator 3C: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
 - C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program
 - FFY 2023 Target: 72.21%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 74.60%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or

exited the program

- FFY 2023 Target: 58.12%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 57.41%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 3C2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs within age expectations
 - FFY 2023 Target: 56.76%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 57.41%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - The definition of slippage is a worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target. The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage
 - For "large" percentages, it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example: It is not slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator X is 32% and the FFY2022 data was 32.9% (32% is below target). It is slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator X is 32% and the FFY2022 data was 33.1%
 - For "small" percentages, it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example: It is not slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator Y is 5% and the FFY2022 data was 5.1%. It is slippage if the FFY2023 data for Indicator Y is 4.9% and the FFY2022 data was 5.1%
- Indicator 4: Family Involvement
 - Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments
 - Results Indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services helped the family (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)
 - A- Know their rights
 - B- Effectively communicate their children's needs
 - C- Help their children develop and learn
 - Based on Family Outcome Survey. KECDS increased survey returns from 11.01% in FFY 2021 to 19.80% in FFY 2023
 - Indicator 4A: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights
 - FFY 2023 Target: 93.74%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 94.54%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
 - Indicator 4B: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs
 - FFY 2023 Target: 95.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 96.06%
 - Status: Met Target

- Slippage: No Slippage
 - Indicator 4C: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn
 - FFY 2023 Target: 94.25%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 95.30%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find
 - Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers, birth to age 1 with IFSPs (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B) and 1442)
 - Kansas consistently ranks above average in the nation on our Child Find Indicators (Indicators 5 and 6)
 - FFY 2023 Target: 2.20%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 2.02%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find
 - Results Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers, birth to 3 with IFSPs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)
 - Kansas consistently ranks above average in the nation on our Child Find Indicators (Indicators 5 and 6)
 - FFY 2023 Target: 5.18%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 5.38%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Child Find
 - Compliance Indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)
 - Compliance indicators are required to be set at 100%
 - FFY 2023 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.82%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition
 - Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has
 - Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday
 - FFY 2023 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.87%

- Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition
 - Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has
 - Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services
 - FFY 2023 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.31%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C/Effective Transition
 - Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has
 - Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services
 - FFY 2023 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.80%
 - Status: Did Not Meet Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 8
 - Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services
 - FFY 2020 Data: 98.27%
 - FFY 2021 Data: 99.76%
 - FFY 2022 Data: 99.85%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.87%
 - Notified the State Education Agency and the Local Education Agency
 - FFY 2020 Data: 98.73%
 - FFY 2021 Data: 99.18%
 - FFY 2022 Data: 99.31%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.31%
 - Conducted the transition conference
 - FFY 2020 Data: 99.24%
 - FFY 2021 Data: 99.32%
 - FFY 2022 Data: 99.62%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 99.80%
- Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision
 - Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

- This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA
- Indicator 10: Mediation
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision
 - Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)
 - States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.
- Indicator 11: Percent of Medicaid eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate positive social emotional skills within age expectations
 - FFY 2023 Target: 45.20%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 45.80%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage
- Indicator 12: General Supervision
 - Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C
 - Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State lead agency's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its Early Intervention Service (EIS) Providers and EIS Programs for requirements under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance.
 - FFY 2023 Target: 100.00%
 - FFY 2023 Data: 100.00%
 - Status: Met Target
 - Slippage: No Slippage

Motion to approve SICC SPP/APR

Motion to approve: Susan Bowles

Second: Courtney Hochman

Discussion: None

Action: Approved

SEAC SPP/APR

Brian Dempsey

- State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators
 - Indicator 1: Graduation
 - Indicator 2: Drop Out
 - Indicator 3: Assessments
 - 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
 - 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
 - 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
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025 – Anticipate slippage
 - Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

- Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
- Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025 – Anticipate slippage
- Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 22
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Upload January 2025
- Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 22
 - Compliance indicator
 - 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
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No slippage
- Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Compliance Indicator
 - Met Target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?

- No slippage
- Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 20
 - Compliance Indicator
 - Did not meet target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Slippage
- 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 not meet target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No slippage
- 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
 - Met target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No slippage
- Indicator 16: Mediation
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 13
 - Did not meet target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?

- No slippage
- Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 21
 - Met target
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - No slippage
- Indicator 18: General Supervision
 - Did Kansas Meet the Target?
 - Baseline Year: FFY 23
 - Did Kansas have Slippage?
 - Data Finalized December 2024
- Indicator 3C Slippage Statements
 - Reading for students that take the DLM Assessment
 - Group A – 4th Grade
 - FFY2022 Data
 - 47.64%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 47.14%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 39.94%
 - Target Not Met
 - Slippage
 - Group B- 8th Grade
 - FFY2022 Data
 - 17.58%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 23.55%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 23.75%
 - Target Met
 - No slippage
 - Group C – High School
 - FFY2022 Data
 - 16.29%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 14.59%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 17.02%
 - Target Met
 - No slippage anticipated. Data not yet loaded
- Indicator 3C Slippage Statement
 - The students in 4th grade in the 2022-23 school year (from the FFY 2022 SPP/APR) had different academic experiences than those students in 4th grade in the 2023-24 school. Thus, this is likely one of the primary reasons for the differences in proficiency rates for the 4th grade alternate assessment from the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and the FFY 2023

SPP/APR. The students in 4th grade in 2022-23 were likely in 1st and 2nd grade when in-person instruction was suspended or more inconsistent in the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school years. They had at least one year of more traditional education and services in a K-12 academic program than their peers who were in 3rd grade in the 2022-23 school year and did not have a traditional, in-person K-12 academic experience from the end of preschool (if attending preschool) through KG. Missing traditional in-person instruction and services during these foundational grades may have had a noteworthy impact on proficiency rates. This is supported not just by the differences in the alternate assessment proficiency rates for these two groups of students when they were in 4th grade, but also when they were in 3rd grade. Students in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR 4th grade cohort had alternate assessment math and ELA proficiency rates of 14.19% and 46.38%, respectively, when they took the 3rd grade assessment in the 2021-22 school year. Students in the 4th grade in this FFY 2023 SPP/APR had math and ELA proficiency rates of 9.35% and 36.67%, respectively, when they took the 3rd grade assessment in the 2022-23 school year. These substantially lower proficiency rates across the past two years for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR 4th grade cohort taking the alternate assessments supports the state's contention that the lingering instructional impacts of the pandemic is a reason for slippage

- Reading
 - Group A – 4th Grade
 - FFY2022 Data
 - 26.76%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 25.25%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 26.35%
 - Target Not Met
 - No slippage
 - Group B- 8th Grade
 - FFY2022 Data
 - 16.23%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 16.82%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 17.41%
 - Target Not Met
 - Slippage
 - Group C – High School
 - FFY2022 Data
 - 21.51%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 20.61%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 21.86%

- Target Not Met
 - No slippage
- Indicator 3D Slippage Statements
 - To determine possible reasons for slippage, the state looked at various data points, among which the statewide chronic absenteeism data stood out. The state recognizes that students not attending school consistently across a school year will mean they are not regularly receiving instruction on the grade level standards upon which they will be assessed. Accordingly, there is an indication that the higher rates of chronic absenteeism may be linked and/or contribute to lower proficiency rates. The state observed a minor increase in proficiency rates for students with disabilities on the reading statewide assessments for 8th grade and a more substantial increase in proficiency rates for all students, thus contributing to the gap between the two groups. An analysis of the data suggests chronic absenteeism may have influenced the gap in proficiency between students with disabilities and all students. The chronic absenteeism for 8th graders with disabilities was 32% for the 2022-2023 school year, where the chronic absenteeism for all 8th graders was 23%
- Indicator 7A, 7B1 and 7C Slippage Statements
 - Indicator 7: Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
 - A- Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
 - B- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
 - C- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
 - A1
 - FFY 22 Data
 - 88.33%
 - FFY 23 Target
 - 90.17%
 - FFY 23 Data
 - 87.10%
 - Slippage
 - A2
 - FFY 22 Data
 - 60.75%
 - FFY 23 Target
 - 63.53%
 - FFY 23 Data
 - 59.28%
 - Slippage
 - B1
 - FFY 22 Data
 - 88.37%
 - FFY 23 Target
 - 86.94%

- FFY 23 Data
 - 86.55%
 - Slippage
 - A2
 - FFY 22 Data
 - 61.23%
 - FFY 23 Target
 - 62.93%
 - FFY 23 Data
 - 60.99%
 - No Slippage
 - C1
 - FFY 22 Data
 - 89.48%
 - FFY 23 Target
 - 90.60%
 - FFY 23 Data
 - 87.18%
 - Slippage
 - C2
 - FFY 22 Data
 - 74.04%
 - FFY 23 Target
 - 76.30%
 - FFY 23 Data
 - 71.48%
 - Slippage
- Indicator 7A, 7B1 and 7C Slippage Statements
 - An examination of state-level data for this indicator suggests that disruptions in preschool special education services, such as staffing shortages and turnover, may have impacted children's ability to make expected progress. Residual impacts from the pandemic, such as delayed referrals or social-emotional effects, may have carried over, affecting developmental progress this year more than anticipated. Although data reporting remained consistent, variability in how COS ratings were determined or applied across districts may have occurred. Subtle shifts in team decision-making or documentation practices may also have contributed to the slippage.
- Indicator 10 Slippage Statement
 - Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories
 - 5
 - Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification
 - 3
 - Number of district that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size
 - 257
 - FFY 2022 Data

- 0.78%
 - FFY 2023 Target
 - 0%
 - FFY 2023 Data
 - 1.17%
 - Status
 - Not Met
 - Slippage
 - Yes
- Indicator 10 Slippage Statement
 - Over the past year, KSDE has reviewed the method of identifying noncompliant districts. Due to this review, the process for identifying noncompliant districts became more rigorous in order to ensure appropriate identification of students across the state
- OSEP Required Actions: Compliance Indicators
 - 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.

SICC ESIDS

FY23 SLDS Grant & Early Childhood Integrated Data System

Bert Moore

- What is an SLDS?
 - Statewide Longitudinal Data System
 - A data system that combines data from multiple agencies to help answer questions about student learning and outcomes. SLDS can include data from early childhood education, K-12 schools, community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, workforce programs, and services
- An SLDS can:
 - Help educators identify student's academic strengths and weaknesses
 - Increase student achievement
 - Close achievement gaps
 - Identify and address potential recurring impediments to student learning
- What is an Early Childhood Integrated Data System
 - An Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) collects, integrates, maintains, stores and reports information from early childhood programs

across multiple agencies within a state that serve children and families from birth to age eight

- Why ECIDS?
 - Data integration is a high priority for those seeking to make data-informed decisions
 - Facilitates the technical and organizational collaboration that leads to data-informed cross-program planning and decision-making
- Integrating data supports both child and family outcomes
 - Allows decisions to be made to improve services
- Public Health Issues span multiple sectors
 - Childhood illness not only falls on healthcare providers, but it also falls on educators, schools, families, and communities
- Expected Outcomes of the Grant
 - Connecting early childhood data from multiple systems, programs, and state agencies to affect positive outcomes and police for children to thrive
 - A robust data governance system that ensures the ECIDS provides data that is secure, valid, reliable, actionable and provides useful insights for informed decision-making
 - The ability to calculate a distinct count by assigning every child participating in early childhood programs a unique identifier that is consistent across early childhood platforms and remains constant throughout PK-12
- Expected Outcomes of the Grant
 - Architect a centralized ECIDS infrastructure that is flexible enough to stand alone, is scalable, and integrates with the P20W SLDS
 - Produce customizable data analytics dashboards to provide reliable, high-quality, actionable data to early childhood and education stakeholders
- Comment from the room: The work is being led by KSDE and they have been working with DCF and KDHE to develop user agreements so that they can share their data. So if a child is in Part C services, they're going to get an ID number, currently we call it a SSID. We will be able to track this over time, or for Parents as Teachers, we'll be able to look at that so if there's been a student in elementary school and is quite successful in their state assessments, we will be able to look back and see what services did the child receive up to that point. We will be able to track if there is a difference between their family participating in Parents as Teachers or some other home visiting program that our children have opportunities to do so? It is really exciting to be able to think about really drilling down to see which programs are effective and are really making a difference. Long term, I think the goal is 2 years, to have this up and running. It's in the design phase right now. I cannot answer a lot of questions today but Kyle Lord or Trevor Huffman can provide you with additional support since they both serve on that planning committee. Kyle is an assistant director of Instructional Technology at KSDE
- Comment from Bert Moore: If you do have any questions and you are a SEAC member, please let me or Lindsey know and we will get that moved along

SICC & SEAC C to B

Brian Dempsey

Stacy Clarke

- Stacy Clarke: KSDE and KDHE have been meeting monthly for almost a year to talk about transition, because we get a lot of questions across the state as children are moving from Part C and infant toddler programs to preschool programs. It is not as smooth and efficient as we would like for it to be. Sometimes we talk about specific issues, what's going well, and what is not going well. The goal is to come up with clear guidance and provide that guidance to special education administrators, we'll provide it in some of our trainings that we have. Our latest discussion is to make sure that if there's an inquiry as to how they should be doing something, or what are the details of it, they just need some clarification in a specific district and infant toddler program, we are trying to make sure we share the clarity with both the special education program with the Local Education Agency, and the infant toddler program so they're hearing the same thing
- Brian Dempsey: In addition to all of that, Tricia (Waggoner) and I are meeting with Families Together periodically as well, to have these ongoing conversations and get that parental input from Leslie (Girard) and what she is hearing, so that has been very productive
- Bert Moore: One of the issues that we are encountering is during the onsite visit from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) they interviewed different parent groups, KSDE and KDHE, and they had some concerns that came up. They were told some things during that visit and if there was one thing that was shared, they thought of it as being pervasive. So if one parent or one provider said something was not happening, or that this happened, OSEP seemed to believe it was happening across the state. We at KSDE then had to assure them that we were providing appropriate guidance to the field and that we were working with KDHE, and that it wasn't oppositional. One of the things discussed is that all of the districts were supposed to have a local interagency coordinating council. And was that happening? What were they doing at that LICC, because it should be Part B and Part C. One of the things that was a concern to us is how can we be consistent across our system? For example, we had Part C individuals that said they were telling Part B providers what the student needed when they transitioned and Part B was not listening to them, they were doing something different. So who takes over the control, if you will, for a student program at age 3, does the Part C provider still have influence on that? They're invited to the meeting, they are supposed to be providing some information and supports, but does Part B then take that on? And what do we do when we disagree about services? Another issue we were hearing was that some of the systems were requiring a screening of students instead of going to a comp eval. And I have met with Part B directors on multiple occasions and said you have two things you can do. You have a prior written notice that says you will evaluate the child because they're already identified as having a disability by being in Part C, or you send one that says we won't and here's why. And then the parent can file paperwork to get the evaluation completed. I wanted to be sure our providers knew, screening is not allowed. Screening takes place in Part C. You do that when you identify. If it's a Child Find issue for a child not yet identified then yes Part B would have responsibility to do that from birth to age 21. The screening is for non-identified students, birth to age 3. So we wanted you to be aware that we're aware of some of the concerns, and then we are addressing it from a Part B perspective for where the accountability responsibility falls on Part B, but we also want Part C to know we're not just deaf eared about it, we are not ignoring when there

is a difference of opinion about what should be happening. So when we set this up, it was to have an open discussion about what Part C was seeing, if they're seeing anything that's being unresolved that could be brought to the table for Part C and Part B to have a discussion. If Part B needs to intervene and meet with an LEA or other system director then that's what we need to do so that we can make sure that we are following appropriate practices

- Comment from Tricia Waggoner: I am still relatively new to the Part C system, I've been with Part C since 2021. Since that time we've been working a lot at the State level to get better communication across Part C and B. And one of the things that we've been doing is when we see hotspots, as I call them, where there's some communication problems at the local level between the local Part C partners and the local Part B partners, we've been going in and having meetings, lengthy meetings between these partners including the local Part C program, the local Part B program, and the LICC, and meeting in person with these groups to work through these communications. At first you think these folks are never going to agree on anything. And then, by the time you work through everything, you do have agreements in place and everybody is back on the same page and talking again because when it comes down to it, both partners do want what is best for the children, you just have to get to that point and it's a long process sometimes. We do see an increase in disagreement between people that's happening at organizations and it's happening in organizations that I am participating in like nonprofits. When we are talking about an increase in complaints, it is another thing we are seeing but getting in the same room with two people and working through it, it works. And talking regularly at the state level as to where we want programs to go and how we want to emphasize the importance of communication. This has been really great for Kansas children as a whole
- Lindsey Graf: Is there anything that anyone wants to share? Part B or C? That kind of centers around the issues that you're seeing or things that we may be able to help address? Things of that nature
- Comment from the room: I work in both the Part B and Part C world, and I am at a lot of director's meetings and coordinators meetings. There's a couple of things that keep coming up and I'm sure that many of us all know those, and at this level we know about them. But at the provider level, I think there is some confusion. But the rules for qualification are very different between Part C and Part B. For example, in Part C there is no 504, if there's a disability then they're going to qualify. And so when you do the transition meeting, sometimes the Part C providers don't understand when Part B says, Well they're not going to qualify now for us, because it has the 2 prong test, a need along with a disability. So there's things like that that I think sometimes are confusing between the 2 worlds. The other thing is, and even at the Federal level, it's been very confusing for me is that we have natural environments in Part C and we talk about working in the home and very closely with parents. But when you get to Part B home-based services technically are a more restrictive environment than, for example, a preschool with other peers that may not have disabilities. And that's a big shift in a different way of thinking. And so sometimes those kinds of nuances really are confusing even to those in the business, but to a lot of providers that maybe don't know those things. So again, I think both KSDE and KDHE have been working to share the education with each other on the differences in our programs. But I think that's so often a communication piece that people just don't understand how they're different

- Comment from the room: I am coming from two perspectives, but I am a chair of an LICC, and I think I feel like I do appreciate the state level conversations that are now happening. I think it has been a real challenge, the LICC struggles to know our roles when these situations come up and how to help, and honestly, we would not have gotten anywhere had we not got involvement from both KSDE and KDHE in our specific situation. I very much appreciated the support but also felt extremely helpless as an LICC to be able to help our Part C partner and work to have a good relationship and good partnership with that Part B partner. I don't think we are perfect and I do think there's still ongoing challenges with the continuum of placement discussions. So, I think that is an ongoing issue, that some of why Part C feels the need to be involved when they see the continuum placement not being offered as part of a discussion
- Bert Moore: You mentioned the continuum of placement and I think that is critical when considerations are made for students with significant disabilities in particular, and we know who those students are. And we have to look at the preschool as our first opportunity really to serve those students. And then what support can we provide them? Because one of our indicators is Indicator 6, that is the least restrictive environment. So we do collect the data on least restrictive environment. And we want our students served with general education students. So when you have a system that says we don't offer that, then you need to contact KSDE. You need to let us know that because that is the wrong thing to tell any parent, or anyone, that we don't offer that. We have to have that continuum of placements as an option from ages 3 through 21, and just because the school districts never dealt with it before, that doesn't mean they can put their head in the sand and ignore it. I think of every child as my individual child, and what would I want for my child. I don't think in terms of systems and never have. And in my role, currently, I don't because I think about each child getting what they need and in the least restrictive environment. So, I think you'll find that our agency is very supportive of you. If you let us know you're hearing that, because we were told at one point there was an agency that said we don't serve three-year-olds. That was the wrong thing to say. So once we know, we'll deal with it. But please let us know if you're running into issues and problems with individual districts because I do know they are out there. We want to train them. We want to help them, to be sure they are meeting the requirements for our students and our parents, because we can't forget we have families involved here, too. So, once we all work together, we can do great things
- Comment from the room: I love what you said at the very end. When we all work together, we can do great things. My parents taught me that no news is good news, but I have learned that is not true with transition, so never assume it's going well just because you haven't heard. And so one of the things we've started doing with our Part C and Part B programs is meeting quarterly, just a quick check up and check in. It's hard to talk about things that aren't going well, So we do roses and thorns and that seems to kind of help people share things that are again going well and things that we can tighten up. It's really been nice from a coordinator standpoint and a director standpoint because we can go back and gather information and it's more of a conversation instead of when I get that email from the Part B partner and my heart drops and start sweating. Nothing good ever happens. But now I actually look forward to hearing from them, and it's not happened overnight and things are not perfect. But it is definitely about working together and understanding the systems are not the same. And I don't fully understand Part B and eligibility. And that's my responsibility to also talk to our Part C staff about

that because they don't understand Part B eligibility either. And so again, just kind of deferring to the experts. We know why children are and are not qualifying. We may not always agree with it but referrals come to Part C and they don't qualify and referral partners don't agree with it. So again, it happens to everybody just at different parts of the referral process

Medicaid Billing

Heather Gould

- I am Heather Gould and I am the Project Director for the School Based Services Grant. I was hired at the end of October so I am still very new to this position. I actually came from KSDE. So the school-based grant is a three year grant that started in July 2024 and will end June 30, 2027. The purpose of this grant is to make some necessary updates to the Medicaid State Plan and with administrative claiming guides. The proposed expansion will extend Medicaid coverage. It will redesign the State plan amendments and enable broader service coverage. And then what you're probably most interested in is the benefits to the school and students, and the main benefit is strengthening the existing system, equipping schools for proper billing and payment processes and sustainable service provisions. It also is increasing access to essential services, and that's the main goals of the grant, the school-based services grant. I'm currently working on a stakeholder list that I will be contacting at the end of the planning to get your feedback, and get some school feedback. Maybe next month I will have more time to be able to develop a PowerPoint and give more in depth information about the grant. I have to go through many channels to get my PowerPoint approved to be able to present on it and give the presentation. I'm going to be at the conference in Wichita at the end of this month. So if any of you have any specific questions and you're going to be there, please reach out to me. The whole point is for me to get my boots on the ground and meet all of you and to listen to your needs and if you have any questions please ask and I will try to answer
- Lindsey Graf: Heather, I understand the information that you did share today, I know you have to go through the proper channels to be able to have a PowerPoint, but is that information that you can share today available to be shared with us at all
- Bobbie Graff-Hendrixson: Good afternoon, I am Bobbie Graff-Hendrixson, I am the Deputy Medicaid Director. I am quite the advocate for school-based services. I too am a teacher and licensed master's level social worker. My teaching was done in Southern California. CMS has it's rules for releasing their grant information. The reason why we are not allowed to actually post the grant or the information is because it does contain personal identifiable information. And within that information there is some security information that identifies persons that CMS will not allow to have posted. I have asked if I could redact that information and the request was denied. That is just part of our federal partners processes. We are working on a pamphlet that gives some highlights on the grant, but as Heather stated, the main objective of the grant is to assist our school districts and assist them with the billing processes. That has been a challenge for some of our partners. We want to have that opportunity to open up our Medicaid State plan and we are very hopeful we can open up our Chip State plan to offer school-based services to a wider variety of children, and not just those children that are identified on an IEP. That is a major rewrite to the Medicaid state plan and it will go

through many levels of approval processes. As all of you folks know, we are going through a new administration at the Federal level. We have been told by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services that any amending of our Medicaid State plan will be coming to a halt, not only for Kansas but all states and territories. The reason why is because the new administration has the opportunity to appoint their leadership in those positions that will be approving those final documents. The Medicaid State plan is considered a contract between the State and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. When we are amending the State plan we will be working with our partners, and those partners are the parents of those children with whom we are all called to serve. One of the first things Heather will be doing is attending the SCAC Conference in Wichita, to get ideas. Our Medicaid State plan right now is very restrictive. You cannot bill for any child that is not on Medicaid and does not have those services that are identified in the Medicaid State plan but also identified on an IEP. So, we do indeed want to do everything we can to open that up so that administrative claiming is available for our schools, because as you know, once you receive claiming funds, those are your funds as a school district to use as you see fit to serve the needs of those children

- Lindsey Graf: Thank you Bobbie. Just looking at the timeline a little bit, it started in July 2024 and I blinked and we are in 2025. And so I'm afraid we're going to be through that first year. We are getting to the point to trying to , you know establish processes and procedures. And now we are also going to hit a halt at the federal level. With the change in federal leadership as well as just the process, do you feel we will get to the point where we are going to have to maybe then apply for an additional grant funding to try and make the moves
- Bobbie Graff-Hendrixson: As you know, hiring in the State takes along time. We are behind but we are not the only state that is behind. But I am still very encouraged by all the work that Heather has accomplished and her project plan that she has in front of her. We spoke to our project leader at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid this morning, and she is also very encouraged by the progress we have made. It is very bureaucratic. It takes time but I promise we are getting there. I appreciate your patience. I believe you have Heather's email, and Heather would be happy to forward your emails to me and I am happy to assist and help in any way that I can.

Legislative Discussion

- Bert Moore: Dr Harwood is not going to make it. He is at the State Board of Education meeting today. So, one of the things that I do know is we haven't received an Education agenda. We have new leadership in education in the House and the Senate. I do not know what they've come up with on their platforms yet. We did have an at-risk meeting yesterday where we were talking about the new at-risk legislation that requires agencies to address a quarter of students and follow them over a period of time, I believe four years, and then have to report out whether those students have mastered the curriculum to a level of 70% of them being a level 3 or level 4 on the state assessments. So there are two groups that have been formed at KSDE to address that and then that will be shared out to districts. There are 13 cohort districts right now that are participating in the at-risk project, so they're going to be supporting this work. We have Jake Steele that will be leading one of the committees and we also have Dale Brungart, who is going to work on the fiscal side of that. But that came out of legislation

last year. Renee Erickson will be leading the House Education Committee and we were told Dave Thomas will lead the Senate Education Committee because Molly resigned. Jake and Dale will work with the 13 cohorts on the pilot program this year to see how it works. The implementation year is next year. Each district gets to decide who their cohort is going to be, they get to decide the population and the at-risk factors they want to identify. If districts don't meet the cohort requirements by 2030, they will start to see a reduction in their at-risk funds.

Ex-Officio Member Reports

Families Together

Lesli Girard - SEAC Report July-September 2024

- 3,100 individualized consultations
 - Ethnicity Breakdown
 - African American - 9%
 - Asian - 2%
 - Caucasian - 68%
 - Hispanic - 13%
 - Native American - 0%
 - Two or more Races - 1%
 - Not Determined/Other - 7%
 - Age of child/youth
 - Birth through age 2 – 2%
 - 3 to 5 – 15%
 - 6 to 13 – 50%
 - 14 to 18 – 30%
 - 19 to 21 – 2%
 - 22 and over – 1%
 - Primary Disability
 - Autism – 521
 - Suspected Disability – 279
 - Other Health Impairment – 157
 - Emotional Disability – 144
 - Developmental Delay – 139
 - No IDEA Disability – 118
 - Specific Learning Disability - 112
 - Intellectual Disability – 100
 - Multiple Disabilities - 61
 - Speech or Learning Disability – 48
 - Traumatic Brain Injury – 11
 - Gifted – 10
 - Orthopedic Disability – 9
 - Hard of Hearing - 8
 - Visual Disability – 2
 - Deaf/Blindness – 2
 - By Contact Content (Top 20)
 - 731 – Family Support

- 624 – IEP
- 435 – Families Together Info
- 300 – CHASE
- 280 – Community Services
- 266 – Family Engagement
- 210 – Mental Health
- 208 – Parental Rights
- 207 – Behavior/BIP/FBA
- 189 – Comprehensive Evaluation
- 150 – Education Advocate
- 139 – CINC – Child in Need of Care
- 128 – Accommodation/Modifications
- 124 – Section 504
- 106 -Parental Information
- 98 – School Issues
- 93 – Parent Involvement
- 86 – Person Centered Planning
- 82 – Extra-Curricular Activities
- 74 – Placement Options
- By Contact Content – Others
 - 73 – Transition to Adulthood
 - 71 – Suspension/Expulsion
 - 57 – Hospitals/Clinics
 - 50 – Related Services
 - 50 – Medicaid
 - 49 – Goal Setting
 - 47 – Care Coordination
 - 45 – Self Advocacy
 - 43 – Formal Complaint
 - 38 – Family School Partnership
 - 38 – HCBS Waiver
 - 37 – IHP
 - 36 – Primary Care
 - 36 – Spanish Information
 - 36 – Public Health Care Financing
 - 36 – Providing Information
 - 36 – Oral Health
 - 34 - MDR
- CHASE Your Dreams Podcast
 - Natalie with the CHASE Program guides us through the benefits of good posture, strong voice, and positive affirmations in the “Superhero Pose” activity
- Education Advocate
 - Month: October 2024
 - Appointments 59; New Appointments 37
 - Cancellations 49; Final Cancellations 29
 - Total Processed: 88
 - Early Childhood Appointments: 9

- Month: November 2024
 - Appointments 54; New Appointments 35
 - Cancellations 40; Final Cancellations 21
 - Total Processed: 75
 - Early Childhood Appointments: 7
- Month: December 2024
 - Appointments 52; New Appointments 31
 - Cancellations 45; Final Cancellations 25
 - Total Processed: 77
 - Early Childhood Appointments: 7

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.

Kansas State School for the Deaf

Luanne Barron

- The Kansas State School for the Deaf is located in Olathe, Kansas
- Currently serve over 150 students both deaf and hard of hearing, ages 3 to 21 years old
- We provide early intervention services to 184 infants and toddlers all over the State
- We provide bilingual ASL and English education to make sure that students develop fluency in both languages
- We also provide outreach services across 62 counties in Kansas, totalling 795 services benefiting students and families statewide
- KSSD is fully accredited by KSDE and CEASD, Conference of Educational Administrators for Schools and programs for the Deaf
- The goal is to provide full access to both languages and ensure that deaf and hard of hearing students achieve academic success comparable with their hearing peers. Success is not only about academic achievement but also about personal growth including emotional intelligence, resilience, leadership and social development

- We strongly encourage participation in extracurricular activities, supporting well-being and also preparing students for future careers to help them reach their full potential in all aspects of their life
- Our outreach program is called Sound Start. It is a comprehensive early intervention program for children, birth to age 3, who are deaf and hard of hearing. We work in close collaboration with Sound Beginnings, the program that is responsible for newborn hearing screenings. We also work with Kansas Early Childhood Development services to identify and provide support to families of infants and toddlers who are deaf and hard of hearing. Sound Start partners with early childhood development services all across the State to deliver quality services tailored to children with an emphasis on language acquisition. Our demand for services has grown significantly over the past two years
 - In 2023, 147 infants and toddlers were served with a total of 939 home visits
 - In 2024, it increased to 184 with a total of 1,282 home visits
- KSSD is actively collaborating with KDHE to advocate for increased legislative support and services and resources to expand services for children birth to age 3. Increased support and funding are vital to ensuring that each family has access to the resources they need for their child's development
- Our Language Assessment Program, LAP, for the deaf and hard of hearing students is a state mandated initiative that provides and conducts language assessments for children from birth to age 8 to also monitor progress in achieving key language milestones in ASL and/or English. Those assessments are an essential tool for tracking early language development and ensuring that young children have access to language skills that are necessary for their academic and social success. The program plays a key role in shaping policy, supporting services for young, deaf and hard of hearing students all across the State. The annual report of LAP in the fiscal year 2024, will be submitted to the Senate Education and the House K-12 Education Committee by the end of this month. If you are curious about the annual report it will be published at KCDHH.KS.GOV
- We do have brochures with information regarding our programs and services, and for our students who are coming to campus from all across the State, link provided:
 - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1oRjzLrrVXu66-iF3W26dSoWp20EHZl4/view>

Kansas State School for the Blind

Jon Harding

- Just a couple of dates I want you to be aware of. Our Celebrate Access Braille and Beyond event will be January 30th , 2025, at our school. We do one in Wichita on February 6th, 2025.
- Our advocacy day at the Capital is February 20th, 2025
- Partnering with the National Federation of the Blind. The Kansas Chapter this year wants to teach our kids how the system works and how they can advocate
- March 25th, 2025 we are hosting Special Education Leaders Forum that is sponsored by Greenbush. The morning is at the school for the Blind and the School for the Deaf is hosting something in the afternoon
- Our Family Infant Toddler (FIT) program serves over 200 kids in partnership with infant toddler programs across the State
- We have a Mobile STEM unit and a Mobile Blind Sports unit and these are really for regular education students to learn about accessibility. They are completely free so if

anyone is interested in having a fun day for their teachers or kids let me know

Items for Next SEAC Agenda

- 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 1:40 pm

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.