

**STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities  
Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**Kansas**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Increased percentage of students with disabilities in grades K–5 who achieve a rate of improvement in reading at or higher than the expected growth for their grade-level peers.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

The Kansas SiMR focus and measurement remain the same, but the calculation has been adjusted based on stakeholder input. To close the achievement gap, students with disabilities need to progress at the same or higher rates of learning as compared to their grade-level peers. The rate of improvement calculation is a metric that drives the decision making for schools; this metric takes into consideration the prior achievement of each student to determine the effectiveness of instruction and interventions.

#### Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

"The FastBridge aReading assessment is a computer adaptive measure of broad reading ability that is individualized for each student. aReading provides a useful estimate of broad reading achievement. The questions and response format used in aReading is substantially similar to many state-wide, standardized assessments" (Illuminate Education, 2022). The FastBridge earlyReading assessment is a comparable measure that provides deeper analyses of early reading skills for students in kindergarten and first grades. Growth percentiles for both assessments are categorized as flat (0–15%), modest (15–39%), typical (40–74%), and aggressive (75–100%). The SiMR is calculated as the number of students with disabilities who reach the typical or aggressive growth levels divided by the total number of students with disabilities who took the assessment in both fall and spring, aggregated across all SiMR cohort schools.

#### Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

The prior SiMR statement addressed the same focus and used the same assessment: Increased Percentage of Students with Disabilities in Grades K–5 Score at Grade Level in Reading as Measured by Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM). These data were analyzed across the past five years. While the percentage of students with disabilities that met grade-level reading achievement standards neared 30%, this analysis did not take into account the prior achievement of students. As identified by stakeholder groups, including the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, intentional focus on a rate of improvement calculation ensures students with disabilities are not falling further behind their non-disabled peers, reflecting their actual growth even if they remain below grade level. This measurement approach upholds the spirit of IDEA by ensuring that students with disabilities are making progress at a rate comparable to or higher than their peers.

#### Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Stakeholder groups, including Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) leadership, Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) and Alignment State Trainers, the Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) evaluation team, and district leadership collaborated to determine the updated SiMR. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers identified the growth measurement as the most influential data point for school and district-level improvement planning. The Kansas Special Education Advisory Council reviewed the proposed SiMR and agreed that the updated calculation will provide more meaningful data at the building, district, and state levels.

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The SiMR cohort is a group of 10 local education agencies (LEAs). Selection criteria included geographic representation across the state, being at the implementation or sustainability phases in Kansas MTSS and Alignment reading by the beginning of the 2022–23 school year, and leadership being able and willing to sign a five-year agreement to share the data to be aggregated for SPP Indicator 17 reporting.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.ksdetasn.org/resources/851>

### Progress toward the SiMR

#### Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

#### Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	55.58%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≥	55.58%	55.70%	55.80%	55.90%	56.00%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Number of students with disabilities in cohort districts who made typical or aggressive growth in reading as measured by the fall and spring CBM-GOM	Number of students with disabilities in cohort districts who were assessed on the fall and spring CBM-GOM	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
294	529	16.12%	55.58%	55.58%	N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The data source is the Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM) utilized within each school. In FFY 2021, all schools in the SiMR cohort administered the FastBridge aReading assessment in second through fifth grades and the earlyReading assessment in kindergarten and first grades.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

All schools in the SiMR cohort administer a universal screening assessment three times a year (fall, winter, spring). The SiMR is calculated using data from the fall and spring universal screening administrations, specifically the assessment for reading. Assessments determine the performance level of each student and the fall–spring growth rate for each student. Data from students with disabilities are used for reporting for Indicator 17. Growth percentiles are categorized as flat (0–15%), modest (15–39%), typical (40–74%), and aggressive (75–100%) based on normative data provided by the assessment publisher. The SiMR is calculated as the number of students with disabilities who reach the typical or aggressive growth levels divided by the total number of students with disabilities who took the assessment in both fall and spring, aggregated across all SiMR cohort schools.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation****Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<https://www.ksdetasn.org/resources/851>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

As described in the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action, Kansas SSIP Logic Model, and Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan, the Kansas SSIP addressed three coherent improvement strategies to achieve the SiMR during the FFY 2021 reporting period:

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 focused on infrastructure development through strategically realigning, reallocating, and leveraging current State Education Agency (SEA) policies, organization, and infrastructure for increased capacity of districts to implement evidence-based practices. As described in the next section, the infrastructure areas addressed in FFY 2021 include data, accountability/monitoring, and professional development.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 focused on supporting the implementation of evidence-based practices through designing, implementing, and evaluating an integrated school improvement framework. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers provided direct training and ongoing coaching to district leadership teams, building leadership teams, and collaborative teacher teams. The professional development increased district capacity to provide effective reading instruction for students with disabilities. As described in the next section, the infrastructure areas addressed in FFY 2021 include data and professional development.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 evaluated the degree to which the state infrastructure supported district implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading results for students with disabilities kindergarten through fifth grade.

During FFY 2021, the timelines for Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0, Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0, and Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 were followed. Evaluation measures were refined and implemented as part of the TASN utilization-focused evaluation process. The principal activities and evaluation plan were fully implemented, and the results of the short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes for each of the three coherent improvement strategies were reported.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) made gains in infrastructure development and alignment that increased the capacity of districts to implement evidence-based practices. In collaboration with Kansas MTSS and Alignment, the KSDE expanded support to LEAs through the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) process. Regional pilot trainings were conducted during FFY 2021 in which LEAs engaged in a continuous improvement process of data analysis, setting goals, selecting strategies, implementing strategies, and analyzing strategies. These regional pilot trainings are continuing and expanding in FFY 2022.

The KSDE, in collaboration with stakeholder groups, enacted the Kansas Education Action Plan for Navigating Next, which provided concise, prioritized guidance for school districts, aligned with the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA) model. Through webinars and a community of practice, the KSDE provided monthly updates on KESA and topics specific to special education that addressed the needs of local leaders as they educated students during a pandemic.

The implementation of evidence-based practices within districts applying Kansas MTSS and Alignment principles included the adoption of evidence-based core and intervention curricula, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement practices. During FFY 2021, leadership teams from the SiMR cohort districts participated in implementation coaching to sustain the evidence-based practices of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Kansas MTSS and Alignment continued on-site coaching and expanded virtual training options. During FFY 2021, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers enacted the MTSS Inclusive Practices Site Visit Protocol to provide feedback to elementary school leadership on their inclusive practices during reading and math instruction. This protocol analyzed the extent to which all students with disabilities are included in core courses, accessing core instruction, and engaging with peers and teachers. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on student learning, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment team provided open-access resources to support all districts in teaching critical standards in reading, math, and behavioral and social-emotional learning. While the SiMR focused specifically on the reading achievement of students with disabilities in kindergarten through fifth grade, Kansas MTSS and Alignment holistically supported sustainable, districtwide implementation of an integrated reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional model from early childhood through graduation. By following this framework, each student, specifically students with disabilities, received the instruction and interventions necessary to improve reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes.

The evaluation of the SSIP, Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0, is comprehensive; utilization focused; and designed to support decision making at the classroom, school, district, provider, and state levels. A meta-evaluation, including stakeholder input and feedback, confirmed the evaluation measures, processes, and analyses met the needs of the decision makers at these levels and followed the theory of action and logic model through aligned short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes leading to the SiMR.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

A description of how the State evaluated outcomes and each improvement strategy is provided in the Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan, which directly aligns with the Theory of Action and the Logic Model. Four short-term metrics monitored improvements in knowledge, skills, and collaboration as measured through observation, participant report, document review, and stakeholder ratings. Four intermediate metrics monitored installation of evidence-based practices as measured through implementation fidelity measures, observation, participant report, and stakeholder feedback. Three long-term metrics monitored the sustained implementation of evidence-based practices.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 1.0 focused on improving statewide infrastructure. Activities in place for sustainability include monitoring the delivery of professional development and technical assistance, facilitating communication and collaboration across all levels of stakeholders, and aligning resources across KSDE and TASN providers. A document review was conducted to evaluate the collaborative efforts and determine increased alignment of the KSDE infrastructures that facilitated the implementation of the

Kansas MTSS and Alignment framework. A review and analysis consisting of 189 documents indicated high levels of message alignment across KSDE divisions, TASN providers, and stakeholder groups. The collective message was instrumental in systems alignment that supports districts in the implementation of a tiered framework of supports that improves reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional achievement of students, specifically students with disabilities, from early childhood through graduation. While the review found numerous discussions of challenges associated with educating children during a pandemic, stakeholder meetings, including the Special Education Advisory Council, the TASN Leadership Team, the State Board of Education, and the Special Education Administrators' Workgroup, remained focused on the tenants of MTSS as a means to maintain evidence-based practices while being flexible in learning modalities and timelines.

Strategy 1.0 included the alignment of state policies and priorities for comprehensive school improvement through collaborative, data-based decisions. In collaboration with Kansas MTSS and Alignment, the KSDE expanded support to LEAs for the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation process. All LEAs in the pilot set continuous improvement goals based on one or more of the five Kansas State Board of Education outcomes and 90% set goals specifically on reading achievement.

To promote shared understanding, the KSDE hosted the annual Summer Leadership Conference, which had 373 registrants representing numerous stakeholder groups: 25 KSDE staff members, 38 TASN providers (including six Kansas MTSS and Alignment staff members), 168 district personnel, 98 personnel from special education cooperatives and interlocals, 43 personnel from other educational agencies, a representative of the Kansas Parent Training and Information Center. Thirty-eight out of 41 (91%) of Kansas' special education cooperatives/interlocals were represented. Representatives were present for 30 out of 33 (93%) of the districts that do not use a cooperative or interlocal for special education services. Conference materials were made publicly available, resulting in 22 resources for educational leaders focused on evidence-based practices that promote achievement for students with disabilities.

TASN Quarterly Meetings build coherence among KSDE and TASN staff and facilitate collaboration leading to effective and efficient use of human capital. Attendance at each meeting averaged 17 KSDE staff, 16 Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, 47 other TASN providers, and three members of KSDE's Technical Assistance Team. Activities to foster alignment included learning about the work of each TASN project and KSDE's Special Education and Title Services team, exploring equity considerations in the Network, and reflecting on alignment to SPP APR indicators.

Coherent Improvement Strategy 2.0 concentrated on the implementation of evidence-based practices in LEAs. The expanded TASN system fully incorporated the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project in FFY 2015. Implementation was sustained and scaled up through FFY 2021. In FFY 2016, the project provided intensive coaching in implementation of MTSS structures to 18 Kansas school districts (87 buildings and 32,255 students, including 5,460 students with disabilities); FFY 2017, 31 districts (266 buildings and 128,604 students, including 18,501 students with disabilities); FFY 2018, 43 districts (307 buildings and 140,075 students, including 20,954 students with disabilities); FFY 2019, 51 districts (271 buildings and 105,851 students, including 16,298 students with disabilities); FFY 2020, 60 districts (353 buildings and 138,081 students, including 22,080 students with disabilities); FFY 2021, 63 districts (351 buildings and 135,446 students, including 21,145 students with disabilities).

The MTSS practices include evidence-based core and intervention curricula, universal screening, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and family engagement. Data analyses resulted in district- and building-level action planning to continually refine implementation. In FFY 2021, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project supported 177 districts, providing 25 statewide webinars with 2,231 attendees. The State Trainers worked intensely in 63 of these districts, providing 271 training opportunities with 6,637 registrations and 156 additional coaching and/or training events. A TASN evaluator observed 17 trainings; each met all Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development—Version 3 indicators in the domains of Preparing for Learning, Contextualizing the Content, and Transferring Learning to Practice.

Educator collaboration was analyzed using data from ongoing training evaluations and the Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale. Results from 367 instructional staff in SiMR cohort districts showed collaborative and building leadership teams are functioning effectively. For example, 80% of respondents agreed that My collaborative team regularly shares in the responsibility of formal problem solving using data to make decisions.

Of the 250 instructional staff in the cohort districts providing Tier 1, 2, or 3 reading instruction, 91% agreed that All students, including students with disabilities and English learners, are included in core reading instruction; and 86% agreed that When screening data indicate need regarding a student's reading, the student is placed in appropriate interventions. Of the administrators, 100% indicated that schoolwide decisions on instruction and curricula are based on data and 92% indicated that the school had a process for regularly sharing data with staff.

The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers conducted observations and walk-throughs to promote implementation and verify data. Process measures included the MTSS Inclusive Practices Site Visit Protocol, the Classroom Intervention Fidelity Checklist, and inquiry cycle documentation. Implementation fidelity results demonstrated that, through the support of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, schools installed and then improved implementation of evidence-based practices.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Coherent Improvement Strategy 3.0 focused on evaluation of the Kansas SSIP. All the identified activities have been implemented and sustained across multiple years. Qualitative and quantitative measures included observations, document reviews, stakeholder surveys, fidelity measures, and student progress data. Evaluation data demonstrated that stakeholders were integral to decision making, progress was monitored, and adjustments were determined based on data. The quality of the data was examined for limitations that could affect the implementation of the SSIP. To ensure that quality of the evaluation was not affected, policies and procedures of Kansas Data Quality Assurance were closely monitored. The KSDE Data Quality Assurance policies include training and data certification of district staff. Furthermore, the TASN Evaluation project provided additional data verification. The IDEA Data Center guidance on data collection, analysis, and reporting was reviewed to confirm that Kansas Indicator 17 data are timely, accurate, and complete. Self-correcting feedback loops have been constructed within the context of the evaluation to ensure that data continue to guide decision making for schools, districts, TASN providers, and the KSDE.

A meta-evaluation was conducted to ensure the evaluation met the Joint Committee Standards for Educational Evaluation (2010). These standards relate to the utility, accountability, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy of the evaluation. As part of the meta-evaluation, all TASN providers were asked to provide input on the effectiveness of the TASN system evaluation by completing a survey including both Likert and open-ended response items. When asked how well the TASN Evaluation project performed various duties, the percentage of TASN providers responding Working well or Working very well was 90% or above for all 12 Likert items, including the items Promote meaningful collaboration among TASN providers to build shared capacity, Build the skills of your team to collect and utilize evaluation data, Provide evaluation data in an easily interpretable manner, Support your project to streamline the process of providing data to educators to support their decision making, and Support your project in using data to improve project activities. Results were reviewed with the KSDE TASN Leadership Team in order to determine areas for improvement.

Data indicate that the coherent improvement strategies should be continued. During the next reporting period, the KSDE will pilot additional supports within the accreditation process that increase alignment to the Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs and the continuous improvement process. The KSDE will continue to leverage ESSERS and ESSERS-2 funds to mitigate learning loss by elevating evidence-based practices, including professional learning focused on the science of reading, instructional practices that promote students' intrapersonal and interpersonal competency development, and the use of curriculum-based general outcome measures that support schools in determining intervention needs and monitoring the rate of improvement and learning for each student.

During the next reporting period, the Kansas MTSS and Alignment team will continue to provide ongoing professional development and coaching to district and school leadership teams at the structuring, implementation, and sustainability phases. Statewide trainings will focus on Tier 1 reading instruction, classwide intervention, and high-leverage instructional practices.

These next steps for infrastructure improvement will focus on data, monitoring and accountability, and professional development. The evaluation of the Kansas SSIP will be maintained and expanded to include any new activities within each coherent improvement strategy. Measures will continue to include observations, document reviews, stakeholder surveys, fidelity measures, and student progress data.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Through a structured process of districtwide improvement, district and building leadership teams analyzed data, including examining curricula, assessments, leadership, empowering culture, family engagement, reading instruction at all tiers, math instruction at all tiers, behavioral and social-emotional learning instruction at all tiers, and the efficacy of building leadership teams and collaborative teams. These data address the evidence-based practices within Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Data analyses resulted in the implementation of district- and building-level action planning to continually enhance and refine the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment tenants.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The research base for each element of Kansas MTSS and Alignment is outlined at <https://www.ksdetasn.org/resources/662>. The K-12 Reading Implementation Guide, available at <https://www.ksdetasn.org/resources/2444>, describes the evidence-based process for providing tiered reading supports matched to each student's needs.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

During FFY 2021, data from multiple evaluation measures demonstrated that educators have the knowledge and skills necessary to implement the evidence-based practices promoted through the professional learning and technical assistance provided by the Kansas MTSS and Alignment team. During the installation and implementation phases, district and building leadership teams participated in five to six full days of training to develop the necessary structures to implement Kansas MTSS and Alignment. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers provided both onsite and virtual coaching following the coaching practices outlined in the NCSI's Effective Coaching of Teachers: Fidelity Tool Rubric (Pierce, 2014), including adherence to essential ingredients, quality, dose, and participant responsiveness. While the SiMR focused specifically on the reading achievement of students with disabilities in kindergarten through fifth grade, Kansas MTSS and Alignment holistically supported sustainable, districtwide implementation of an integrated reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional model from early childhood through graduation. By implementing the framework, each student, specifically students with disabilities, received the instruction and interventions necessary to improve reading, math, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes. District and building leadership teams analyzed data, including examining curricula, assessments, leadership practices, empowering culture, reading instruction at all tiers, math instruction at all tiers, behavioral and social-emotional learning instruction at all tiers, and the efficacy of building leadership teams and collaborative

teams. Further, they collected and analyzed data from key stakeholder groups, including families. Data analyses resulted in the implementation of district- and building-level action planning to continually enhance and refine the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment. Implementation fidelity results demonstrated that, through the support of Kansas MTSS and Alignment, schools installed and then improved implementation of evidence-based practices. By holistically addressing students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional learning needs through a research-based, decision-making process, students will engage more in learning and improve outcomes, including their reading achievement as measured by the SiMR. The Kansas SSIP Theory of Action, Kansas SSIP Logic Model, and Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan outline the connection between the three coherent improvement strategies, outcomes, and impacts.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The Kansas TASN Evaluation project, in collaboration with KSDE leadership, TASN providers, and stakeholder groups, designed and installed the multiyear Kansas SSIP Evaluation Plan that outlines short- and long-term objectives aligned to the Kansas SSIP Theory of Action and Kansas SSIP Logic Model. The TASN Evaluation project monitors adherence to timelines, implementation, outcomes of infrastructure development, and support for district implementation of evidence-based practices. The evaluation indicators align with the five TASN evaluation outcome domains: (1) Participants increase awareness, knowledge, and skills; (2) Administrators and supervisors create conditions that support implementation; (3) Participants implement evidence-based practices with fidelity; (4) Students and children improve academic, behavioral, and social outcomes; and (5) Schools and organizations sustain implementation with fidelity.

Qualitative and quantitative measures included observations, document reviews, stakeholder surveys, fidelity measures, and student progress data. Evaluation data demonstrated that stakeholders were integral to decision making, progress was monitored, and adjustments were determined based on data. The evaluation measures and timeline were carefully designed to support data-based decision making in the areas of infrastructure development, alignment, and the implementation of evidence-based practices. At both the state and local levels, improvements are facilitated through the use of a problem-solving approach referred to as the self-correcting feedback loop. By using the self-correcting feedback loop, school and district teams access timely data that guide data-informed decisions at the student, grade, school, and district levels. Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers function as coaches and utilize the data to prioritize improvements in knowledge, skills, and implementation within districts. The KSDE TASN Leadership Team analyzes aggregate student, district, and project data to inform infrastructure development and systems improvements. KSDE leadership, in collaboration with stakeholder groups, utilizes evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation, measure progress toward achieving intended improvements, and make modifications to the Kansas SSIP as necessary. Utilizing the NCSI SSIP Infrastructure Development and Progress Measurement Tool: Using Implementation Drivers & Stages of Implementation (NCSI, 2018), the Kansas SSIP is in the implementation or sustainability stage within each implementation driver.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

N/A

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The evidence-based practices and process will be maintained during the next reporting period.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

Evaluation data indicate that the implementation of Kansas MTSS and Alignment constructs promotes the success of each student. Through data-informed decisions, students are placed into and exit interventions in reading, math, and behavioral/social-emotional learning. Implementation and outcome data are summarized in this report and in annual evaluation briefs (<https://www.ksdetasn.org/evaluation/tasn-provider-evaluation-briefs>). During the reporting period, 55.58% of the students with disabilities in the SiMR cohort achieved a rate of improvement in reading at the typical or aggressive levels. Statewide data from the same measurement show that of the 62,462 Kansas students in kindergarten through fifth grade who were assessed in fall 2021 and spring 2022, 53.53% made typical or aggressive reading growth. Of the students who were assessed on the aReading and earlyReading measures, a higher percentage of students with disabilities in the SiMR cohort made typical or aggressive growth compared to all Kansas students in kindergarten through fifth grade.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

Kansas employed two primary mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the Kansas SPP/APR: (1) through five established statewide groups and (2) broad dissemination of learning materials to: build stakeholder capacity in SPP/APR requirements, review and interact with historical and projected Kansas SPP/APR data, consider targets and proposed improvement strategies, and provide feedback through a survey, live meetings, or the collection of stories and experiences about students and families within the context of each indicator.

The five established statewide groups met with KSDE staff on multiple occasions to develop, provide continuous feedback based on data collection and analysis, review progress, identify root causes and improvement strategies, and propose revisions on targets when needed. These groups include the: (1) Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (Kansas's state advisory panel); (2) Kansas Assessment Advisory Council (KAAC); (3) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC); (4) Kansas Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and (5) Kansas School Mental Health Advisory Council. These groups include representatives from parent organizations, multiple state agencies, school districts, higher education, and advocacy organizations.

To facilitate broad in-person and asynchronous stakeholder input, Kansas created a learning pathway designed to build the capacity of diverse stakeholders in understanding the SPP/APR requirements, proposed targets, and proposed improvement strategies; review historical and projected data and interact with data visualizations to consider the impact of different targets; and provide the opportunity to share targeted feedback on proposed targets and open-ended feedback on improvement strategies, progress evaluation, and the opportunity to share the story of stakeholder experiences within the context of a particular indicator.

Kansas distributed information on this learning pathway broadly and connected to distribution networks including, but not limited to: the five established statewide groups referenced above; Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff; distribution on multiple KSDE listservs including to all Kansas superintendents, local board of education clerks, principals, special education directors, early childhood providers, McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons, and schools involved in KSDE's redesign initiative; the Kansas parent training and information center (Families Together) staff and families and education advocates (surrogate parents); local and statewide advocacy organization staff and families; other state agency staff; private schools and organizations that serve primarily students with disabilities; and state commissions focused on the communities of those identifying as a particular race or ethnicity. Kansas also held meetings with the Kansas Integrated Accountability System stakeholder group, made up of special education administrators from each geographical region of the state; Technical Assistance System Network (TASN) providers; and conducted listening sessions at the KSDE TASN summer leadership conference.

Following the stakeholder input period in FFY2020, KSDE staff met with SEAC to review all stakeholder input and propose changes to selected result indicator data collection methodologies. Based on stakeholder feedback, SEAC voted to approve all proposed targets without any changes. In FFY2021 the SEAC also reviewed stakeholder input, the proposed changes, and approved the data collection methodologies, baselines and targets for Indicators 2, 8 and 17 respectively.

#### **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

The KSDE used principles of Leading by Convening (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage stakeholders through each phase of the SSIP process and continues to do so on an ongoing basis. Stakeholders at the local and state levels were intentionally informed of the SSIP implementation and were provided a voice in decision making. Stakeholders are represented by persons with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, teachers, principals, superintendents, higher education faculty, state school staff members, correctional facility staff members, vocational rehabilitation representatives, and other state agencies. Organizations represented by stakeholders include the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, the Kansas Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), the Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC), the Kansas MTSS and Alignment project, the Kansas Learning Network, and the KESA Advisory Council. Additionally multiple internal stakeholders were included from the KSDE Office of the Commissioner, Division of Learning Services, and Special Education and Title Services teams. At the local level, families were engaged as key stakeholders in educational decision making. The TASN Evaluation project, in collaboration with KSDE staff, facilitated input from stakeholder groups, including the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, KSDE and TASN providers, district and school leadership, school instructional staff, and families. The TASN Evaluation project encouraged these stakeholder groups to ask clarifying questions to determine ease of interpretation, the accuracy of the graphical displays, and the usefulness of the data.

One in-person and three virtual TASN Quarterly Meetings were held during FFY 2021. Two key goals of these meetings were (1) to build coherence among KSDE staff and TASN providers and (2) to facilitate collaboration that leads to the effective and efficient use of human capital. Attendance at each meeting averaged 17 KSDE staff, 16 Kansas MTSS and Alignment State Trainers, 47 other TASN providers, and three members of KSDE's Technical Assistance Team. Additionally, meetings were attended by leadership from the Kansas PTI and KPIRC. The TASN Quarterly Meeting evaluation data revealed that participants found the meetings to be relevant, useful, and of high quality. Following each meeting, participants were asked to rate items on a survey using a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Meeting participants provided an average rating of 4.49 for the item I understand how the content/practice is intended to improve outcomes for children and youth; 4.40 for the item I will use the content or implement the practice(s) from this training; and 4.43 for the item Overall, the training was of high quality.

Kansas MTSS and Alignment project leadership shared data with the KSDE through the formal TASN meeting structures and actively participated on KSDE advisory councils and workgroups. The Kansas MTSS and Alignment project received ongoing feedback from district leadership through the series of in-district trainings and coaching visits. The TASN Evaluation project verified data-based decision making and data sharing through document analyses and observations at meetings and trainings. To facilitate the communication of data, the TASN Evaluation project developed a Kansas MTSS and Alignment Evaluation Brief (available at <https://ksdetasn.org/evaluation/tasn-provider-evaluation-briefs>), which was disseminated to KSDE staff and other stakeholder groups. Stakeholder involvement informed training, coaching, and technical assistance for all implementation drivers and all stages of implementation. Stakeholders included district personnel, community and family members, and state-level stakeholder groups.

The Family Engagement Survey–Version 2 (Gaumer Erickson et al., 2022) was deployed to gain feedback from family stakeholders. The survey is based on the National PTA Standards for Family–School Partnerships, and items are separated into the domains of Welcoming Environment, Supporting Student Learning, Effective Communication, Sharing Power and Advocacy, and Community Involvement. Version 2 of the survey, first launched in FFY 2021, involved a substantial revision process in collaboration with KPIRC and with feedback from the KSDE, the Kansas PTI, OSEP, diverse families, and TASN providers. The revision process was driven by a need to ensure that survey items included two-way communication between schools and families. Based on 1,158 responses,



including 251 responses from parents of students with disabilities, results indicate that SiMR cohort families are engaged in decision making for their children. For example, 88% agreed that School staff seek my input to better understand my child and family, and 83% agreed that During conferences, teachers and I exchange valuable information about my child's strengths and challenges.

District and building leadership teams reviewed building- and district-level Family Engagement Survey data to identify strengths and target specific areas for improvement. Through the online data collection portal, districts launched the survey and could review results in real time, family members had the option to complete the survey in one of six languages, and easy-to-interpret data displays were auto-generated for each school and for the district overall. School leaders could view disaggregated displays for parents who identified having a student who received special education services at the school. The composite school- and district-level reports were also generated in six languages in order to promote the sharing of these data with families. Specific actions related to family engagement included developing a process for regularly sharing data with all families and embedding family engagement into the implementation protocol for reading interventions.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

The prior SiMR statement addressed the same focus and used the same assessment: Increased Percentage of Students with Disabilities in Grades K–5 Score at Grade Level in Reading as Measured by Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM). These data were analyzed across the past five years. While the percentage of students with disabilities that met grade-level reading achievement standards neared 30%, this analysis did not take into account the prior achievement of students. As identified by stakeholder groups, including the Kansas Special Education Advisory Council, intentional focus on a rate of improvement calculation ensures students with disabilities are not falling further behind their non-disabled peers, reflecting their actual growth even if they remain below grade level. This measurement approach upholds the spirit of IDEA by ensuring that students with disabilities are making progress at a rate comparable to or higher than their peers.

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

Kansas is proposing to revise FFY2021 baseline because of a change in how the Curriculum-Based Measure General Outcome Measure (CBM-GOM) utilized within each school is now calculated. Prior to FY2021 comparison against grade-level benchmark was used. Kansas is proposing to use a rate of improvement calculation. OSEP expects states to revise baseline data when there is a change in the data source for the indicator that affects comparability of data.

## **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **17 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State has revised its FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## **17 - Required Actions**

reviewed