

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 68.83%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.35%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.46%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 2.45%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 86.11%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 81.42%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 86%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.35% for reading and 99.35% for math. The FFY 2009 data were 99.52% for reading and 99.54% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 98%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 71.64% for reading and 69.60% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 76.33% for reading and represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 67.91% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 82.50% for reading and 82.30% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.34%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 1.20%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that one of 293 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 10 special education students in the district.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that one district was identified as having a significant discrepancy,</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the district’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that 10 of 293 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 10 special education students of a given race/ethnicity in the district.</p>																					
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 699 1583 1175"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">62.82</td> <td align="center">65.06</td> <td align="center">60.00</td> <td align="center">2.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">7.39</td> <td align="center">7.15</td> <td align="center">8.0</td> <td align="center">0.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.53</td> <td align="center">2.51</td> <td align="center">1.98</td> <td align="center">0.02%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62.82	65.06	60.00	2.24%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7.39	7.15	8.0	0.24%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.53	2.51	1.98	0.02%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62.82	65.06	60.00	2.24%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7.39	7.15	8.0	0.24%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.53	2.51	1.98	0.02%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program;</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																
and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]																																		
7. Percent of preschool children age 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. [Results Indicator]	The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 529 1583 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 529 959 630"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 529 1163 630"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 529 1373 630"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 529 1583 630"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 630 959 768">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="959 630 1163 768">84.52</td> <td data-bbox="1163 630 1373 768">86.82</td> <td data-bbox="1373 630 1583 768">86.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 768 959 935">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="959 768 1163 935">85.38</td> <td data-bbox="1163 768 1373 935">86.24</td> <td data-bbox="1373 768 1583 935">86.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 935 959 1040">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="959 935 1163 1040">85.84</td> <td data-bbox="1163 935 1373 1040">86.97</td> <td data-bbox="1373 935 1583 1040">86.74</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1040 959 1138"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 1040 1163 1138"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1040 1373 1138"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1040 1583 1138"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1138 959 1276">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="959 1138 1163 1276">65.66</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1138 1373 1276">65.85</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1138 1583 1276">65.66</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1276 959 1446">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="959 1276 1163 1446">62.65</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1276 1373 1446">63.42</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1276 1583 1446">64.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1446 959 1507">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to</td> <td data-bbox="959 1446 1163 1507">77.93</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1446 1373 1507">78.42</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1446 1583 1507">77.29</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.52	86.82	86.43	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	85.38	86.24	86.88	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	85.84	86.97	86.74	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	65.66	65.85	65.66	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	62.65	63.42	64.10	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to	77.93	78.42	77.29	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.52	86.82	86.43																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	85.38	86.24	86.88																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	85.84	86.97	86.74																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	65.66	65.85	65.66																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	62.65	63.42	64.10																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to	77.93	78.42	77.29																															

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 266 1585 302"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 266 957 302">meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 266 1163 302"></td> <td data-bbox="1163 266 1369 302"></td> <td data-bbox="1369 266 1585 302"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="548 321 1585 386">These data for this indicator represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>	meet their needs (%)				
meet their needs (%)						
<p data-bbox="92 418 522 618">8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p data-bbox="92 638 312 667">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 418 1585 516">The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 64.08%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 67.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 60.50%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 535 1585 600">In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 418 1997 483">OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 703 522 902">9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p data-bbox="92 922 369 951">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 703 1585 768">The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 787 1585 852">The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p data-bbox="548 872 1365 901">The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p data-bbox="548 920 1585 1115">The State reported that 228 of 289 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students of a race/ethnicity, at least 10 students of a specific race/ethnicity in special education, and at least 10 students in the comparison group in Year 1, and 30 students of a race/ethnicity, at least 30 students of a specific race/ethnicity in special education, and at least 30 students in the comparison group in Year 2.</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 703 1997 768">OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 1149 522 1317">10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p data-bbox="92 1336 369 1365">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 1149 1585 1214">The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1234 1585 1299">The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1318 1365 1347">The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p data-bbox="548 1367 1585 1497">The State reported that 256 of 289 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students of the racial/ethnic group in the district, at least 10 students of the racial/ethnic group in the specific disability category, and at least 10 students in the comparison group in Year 1, and at least 30 students of a racial/ethnic</p>	<p data-bbox="1610 1149 1997 1214">OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	group in the district, at least 30 students of a racial/ethnic group in a specific disability category, and at least 30 students in the comparison group in Year 2.	
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.53%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 21 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 11 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.11%. The State's FFY 2009 data were 99.84%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>or student who has reached the age of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1182 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">48.6</td> <td align="center">45.61</td> <td align="center">49</td> <td align="center">-2.99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">72.6</td> <td align="center">67.98</td> <td align="center">73</td> <td align="center">-4.62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher</td> <td align="center">83.2</td> <td align="center">87.28</td> <td align="center">83.5</td> <td align="center">4.08%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	48.6	45.61	49	-2.99%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	72.6	67.98	73	-4.62%	C. % Enrolled in higher	83.2	87.28	83.5	4.08%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	48.6	45.61	49	-2.99%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	72.6	67.98	73	-4.62%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher	83.2	87.28	83.5	4.08%																		

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues						OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</p>						
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 66 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>						<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11,12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Kansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 80%. The State reported that four of five resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 35.80%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 80.95%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 82.4%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 70%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2010 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.89%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>