KY
Part B

FFY2014
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has continued to collaborate with internal and external partnerships to improve the educational outcomes of *all* students within the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The KDE has focused on equity, achievement and integrity to provide a world-class education that will lead students to success in their postsecondary endeavors in the job market and life. Since education from cradle to career will impact a student for a lifetime, the KDE has targeted strategic areas of education, including teaching and learning, student performance, accountability, school improvement and district support, including school funding,

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

175

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The KDE strives to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. The general supervision system identifies and corrects noncompliance, supports districts, schools and teachers toward closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities and supports efforts to assist all students in reaching proficiency, graduate from high school and successfully transition to a career or post-secondary education.

The KDE's vision is to ensure that all students are empowered with the skills, knowledge and dispositions necessary to reach proficiency and graduate from high school college and career-ready. The KDE has established the Commissioner's Delivery Unit (CDU) based on *Deliverology* principles. The CDU assesses the KDE's capacity to deliver its most important goals and prioritizes actions to strengthen capacity and achieve results. The CDU uses data analysis and problem solving to enhance the work of the cross-functional agency teams and the strategic planning processes. Additional information regarding the CDU is located on the KDE website at:

http://education.ky.gov/CommOfEd/CDU/Pages/Delivery_Home.aspx

The KDE has three strategic delivery plans: Next Generation Professionals, Next Generation Support Systems and Next Generation Learners. The Next Generation Professionals Plan endeavors to ensure every student is taught by an effective teacher and every school led by an effective leader. The Next Generation Support Systems Plan ensures data will inform decisions as well as teaching and learning. The Next Generation Learners Plan focuses on achievement and growth, gap closure, graduation and readiness. Additional information regarding the KDE's strategic plans is located on the KDE website at:

http://education.ky.gov/districts/tech/kmp/Pages/Strategic-Plan.aspx

The KDE has also established the Novice Reduction for Gap Closure work group along with webpage support, to address gap populations by reducing "novice" performance on the state-wide assessment, known as the K-PREP. Information on the webpage assists districts by providing information, resources and tools designed to reduce the number of students scoring at the novice level on the K-PREP and to improve overall student achievement. The work group has

identified novice reduction as a "moral imperative." It is working to address the levels of novice performance in the state, which includes a large percentage of students with disabilities. Additional information regarding the KDE's Novice Reducation Plan is located on the KDE website at:

http://education.ky.gov/school/stratclsgap/Pages/default.aspx

The KDE has a dispute resolution system to resolve conflicts between parents of students with disabilities and local school districts. The the Division of Learning Services and the Office of Guiding Support Services oversee the KDE's due process hearings, formal written complaints and mediation. Additional information regarding dispute resolution is located on the KDE web site at:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/Dispute-Resolution-Process.aspx

The KDE has a system of monitoring that includes on-site district visits, desk audits,and self-reported compliance data. On-site monitoring visits occur within the KDE's consolidated monitoring process. The DLS conducts additional district on-site visits when areas of support or need are identified.

Consolidated monitoring provides the KDE an opportunity to review state and federal programs with an eye toward effective implementation and collaboration. Aside from individual program reports, districts are provided consolidated reports that represent an opportunity for collaboration among the federal programs. Program monitors identify effective practices during the monitoring visit and provide recommendations for addressing common concerns. The consolidated reports provide opportunities for federal programs to collaborate, streamline implementation and increase success within individual programs.

The Division of Learning Services (DLS) annually collaborates with other divisions to conduct on-site consolidated monitoring visits. During the visits, the DLS verifies the district's self-reported data and issues citations for findings of noncompliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The DLS has also embraced the federal focus on *Results Driven Accountability* (RDA) by including compliance indicators - such as progress monitoring of goals and benchmarks - that affect student outcomes, as part of its compliance monitoring indicators.

The DLS also conducts annual desk audits for *disproprotionate representation* (Indicators 9 and 10) within the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR). The DLS verifies data related to disproportionality and issues citations for noncompliance.

The KDE provides guidance documents to school districts to assist them with complying with the IDEA. The Compliance Record Review Document was written by the DLS and its partners to assist school district personnel in conducting accurate record reviews. The Document and other information and resources on monitoring are located on the KDE website at:

http://education.ky.gov/federal/progs/scmi/Pages/default.aspx

An annotated Guidance Document for Individualized Education Program Development as also developed by the DLS to assist school districts with writing compliant IEPs. The IEP Guidance Document may be found on the KDE website at:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/forms/Pages/IEP-Guidance-and-Documents.aspx

The Kentucky Preschool Program Review (P2R) is a monitoring process intended to create an oversight system leading to improved teaching and learning in Kentucky's Preschool Program. Preschool Programs are monitored on a five-year cycle, with additional monitoring as part of the consolidated monitoring process or on an "as needed" basis.

Kentucky has developed procedures for IDEA finance audits that are also part of consolidated monitoring visits. These visits occur on an annual basis and provide assistance to district finance officers related to Maintenance of Fiscal Effort (MoFE); technical assistance on the KDE accounting system (MUNIS), including expenditures (general ledgers) with allocations, personnel and payroll reports; as well as a review of financial documents, files and records.

The IDEA requires State Educational Agencies (SEAs), such as the KDE, to make annual determinations of local school districts' compliance with IDEA, a process that parallels OSEP's determinations of SEA compliance with IDEA. The KDE has historically used compliance data in making its district determinations. With OSEP revising its SEA determinations to include both compliance and educational outcomes, KDE included educational outcomes for the first time in its district determinations for the 2014-2015 School Year. KDE used its *State Identified Measurable Result* (SiMR) from

its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), as one of the factors used when issueing determinations for local districts.

Infinite Campus (IC), Kentucky's Student Information System (KSIS), provides data for many purposes, including policy making, budgetary planning and educational program management and improvement. The KSIS enterprise system supports the state's 175 school districts (173 local school districts, plus Kentucky School for the Blind and Kentucky School for the Deaf) by providing a secure and seamless integration of data collection needed by school districts and the KDE.

KSIS is the authoritative source for student data. This includes, but is not limited to, student demographics, attendance, behavior, health, grades, grade point average (GPA), graduates, courses and teacher-student class rosters. It also includes program participation for special education, gifted and talented, Title I, Title III, Family Resource and Youth Services Centers, free and reduced meal status, preschool and migrant, as well as information on schools, districts, superintendents, principals and teachers. Additional information regarding the IC and KSIS is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/districts/tech/sis/Pages/default.aspx

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The KDE provides schools and districts with technical assistance through a variety of resources.

The Kentucky Early Childhood Regional Training Centers (RTCs) provide a range of services for the early childhood community. This includes regional trainings/workshops, on-site consultations, a lending library of materials and annual statewide and regional collaborative institutes. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/educational/pre/Pages/PRTC.aspx

Kentucky's Educational Cooperative Network (coops) enhance the educational opportunities and outcomes of students by providing effective regional leadership and delivering specialized services in partnership with the KDE, local school districts, Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) and other service providers.

The coops work with superintendents and staff of their member districts to provide opportunities for collaboration, strategic planning and professional development. They deliver a wide range of customized services to their member districts, including opportunities to network with colleagues.

The coops serve as a regional collaborative forum to enhance quality education, to provide a wide range of support services and to model innovative administrative practices for the benefit of students through a united voice. The coops provide comprehensive educational services and programs that support member districts and schools.

Each coop has a special education division supported by the KDE with IDEA discretionary funds. The coops employ special education consultants to support transition, low incidence and special education initiatives, as well as to support the Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS). Literacy and math specialists, who have special education expertise, have been hired by the coops to be the "boots on the ground," to build district capacity in supporting teachers working with students with disabilities. These efforts are intended to lead all students, including students with disabilities, toward gaining greater access and opportunities to learn the content in the KCAS.

The coops have developed Regional Systemic Improvement Plans (RSIPs) that align with the KDE's SSIP. The SSIP and RSIPs will enable Kentucky to deliver the differentiated technical assistance and the support districts need, to improve

educational results and outcomes for students with disabilities, and to support schools and districts in their comprehensive improvement planning.

Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/Kentucky-Special-Education-Cooperative-Network.aspx

The Kentucky Post-school Outcomes Center (KYPSO) provides support to schools and districts regarding the post-school outcomes of students with disabilities. KYPSO provides information regarding programs and practices to support secondary transition. KYPSO data are used for SPP Indicator 14. Additional information is located on its webpage at:

http://www.kypso.org/home.aspx

The KDE contracts with Kentucky Early Childhood Data System (KEDS) to collect data for SPP Indicator 7. Real-time video conference training sessions are conducted by KEDS to train preschool staff on approved methods for collecting and entering preschool outcome data. The KDE and KEDS staff conducted on-site meetings with preschool administrators and staff in spring 2014 for all school districts.

The KDE offers frequent, ongoing technical assistance (TA) from the KDE's School Readiness branch, the RTCs, the Kentucky Early Learning Leadership Network (ELLN), and KEDS staff. TA to school districts includes phone, email and web trainings in the appropriate use of assessment tools and publishers' data entry systems. Validity measures are discussed with district preschool coordinators at regional meetings, with districts implementing plans to measure the accuracy of assessment data at the local level. Guidance documents for the appropriate use of assessment measures and data collection are maintained, disseminated via training and posted on the KEDS website. Additional information is located on the KDE website at the following link:

http://mediaportal.education.ky.gov/tag/keds/

The KDE has provided guidance documents to support the development and creation of Individual Education Programs (IEPs) in Kentucky. The IEP Guidance Document, the Specific Learning Disability Guidance Document, and the IEP and Lesson Plan Development Handbook are resources available to educators across the Commonwealth. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:
http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/IEP-Guidance-and-Documents.aspx

The State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), awarded to Kentucky in 2012, focuses on two major goals. The first goal targets supporting and training professionals to close the achievement gaps for students with disabilities, primarily through a statewide initiative called Co-Teaching for Gap Closure (CT4GC). The second goal focuses on supporting and training professionals working with students with low incidence disabilities. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/State-Personnel-Development-Grant.aspx

Coaching, funded through the regional cooperatives and the KDE, assists schools and districts in promoting teacher confidence and ensuring competence. Coaching is delivered as regular, embedded professional learning designed to help teachers and staff use the program or innovation as intended and with fidelity.

KDE has contracted with the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP) Center to assist it with the SSIP(SPP Indicator17). Coaching will be a critical part of the SISEP work in Kentucky. Additional information is located at the following webpage links:

http://sisep.fpg.unc.edu/

http://education.ky.gov/school/Documents/DriversBestPracticesCoachingSept_09NIRN.pdf

The KDE's Instructional Support Leadership Networks (ISLN) provide the opportunity for local schools and districts over the long term, to deepen content and pedagogical understandings and competencies, as well as the leadership skills necessary to work with other adults in their own schools and districts. Each network focuses on developing the understandings, abilities and leadership skills necessary to implement Kentucky's Characteristics of Highly Effective Teaching and Learning contextualized in Kentucky's Academic Standards. Additional information is located on the KDE

webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/pages/search.aspx?terms=Instructional+Supervisors+Network&affiliateId=EDUCATION

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky defines Professional Learning in regulation (704 KAR 3:035), as a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to increase student achievement, that strengthens and improves educators' effectiveness in meeting individual, team, school, school district and state goals. It is ongoing, relevant, job-embedded learning for educators at all stages of career development.

Kentucky has professional learning standards to support the preparation of Kentucky's students for college and careers, and requires an effective and continuously improving education system and workforce. To achieve this, Kentucky is establishing a comprehensive system of professional learning for its education workforce. Kentucky has issued new guidance around professional learning. This guidance was created for district-level personnel responsible for professional learning, and others providing or facilitating professional learning. The guidance highlights the regulatory definition of professional learning, as well as Kentucky's Professional Learning Standards.

Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/teachers/PD/Pages/default.aspx

As mentioned above, the Early Childhood Regional Training Centers (RTCs) provide a range of services for the early childhood community including regional trainings/workshops, on-site consultations, lending library of materials and annual statewide and regional collaborative institutes. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/educational/pre/Pages/PRTC.aspx

The Early Learning Leadership Networks (ELLNs) focus on the dissemination and implementation of Kentucky's definition for school readiness, the alignment of Kentucky Early Childhood Standards (KYECS) and Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for improved teaching and learning, as well as leadership and commitment to the implementation of a common kindergarten entry assessment. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/prim/Pages/Early-Learning-Leadership-Networks-(ELLNs).aspx

The Kentucky Educational Cooperative Network (coops) consists of eight educational cooperatives located across the state. Each coop includes a special education division. The KDE provides IDEA discretionary funds to the coops to support special education services in each of the eight regions. All 173 local school districts, as well as the Kentucky School for the Blind and the Kentucky School for the Deaf, are members of the special education division, which is an integral part of the larger educational cooperative.

Kentucky coops provide assistance and expertise for the benefit of their member school districts. Services range from technical assistance, trainings, professional learning, specialized services, research and other needs identified by member districts and the KDE. The coops provide comprehensive educational services and programs that support the member districts and their schools in their school improvement efforts. Member districts also work through the coops to maximize their purchasing power, thereby improving their fiscal efficiency. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/comm/about/Pages/Kentucky-Education-and-Special-Education-Cooperatives.aspx

The Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) is a multi-phase, multi-year project designed to provide Kentucky public school educators with the 21st-century resources needed to carry out highly-effective teaching and learning in every classroom in Kentucky. CIITS went live statewide on August 1, 2011, with Kentucky educators being provided educator-only access.

In CIITS, teachers are able to access Kentucky academic standards that are directly linked and aligned to high-quality, multi-media, instructional resources. These classroom materials are designed to engage students in learning and reinforce the standards being taught. CIITS contains a lesson planning tool and scheduler to help teachers manage standards-based instruction in their classrooms. Teachers may also share instructional resources they design through CIITS.

Teachers may create formative assessments based on particular standards with the help of a test item bank containing more than 11,000 items. When these tests are administered online or with a student response system, teachers can see at a glance how individual students are progressing toward mastery on a particular standard or concept. They can determine where learning gaps exist, so they can more easily design instructional experiences to meet individual student needs and adjust their instruction in support of learning. Additional information is located on the KDE webpage at:

http://education.ky.gov/districts/tech/ciits/Pages/Continuous-Instructional-Improvement-Technology-System.aspx

As noted above, OSEP awarded a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to the KDE in 2012. The SPDG provides professional learning that serves teachers, administrators, coaches and consultants throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky. It has two major goals. One goal supports and trains teachers to close achievement gaps for students with disabilities, primarily through a statewide initiative known as Co-Teaching for Gap Closure (CT4GC). The second goal supports and trains professionals working with students with low incidence disabilities. Additional information is located through the following links:

http://education.ky.gov/school/CT4GC/Pages/CT4GC.aspx

http://louisville.edu/education/splash

The ultimate goal of the KDE is for all students, including students with disabilities, to reach proficiency and graduate from high school ready for college and careers- whether postsecondary education, vocational training, integrated employment, continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living or community participation.

To assist the KDE with reaching its goal for students with disabilities, the KYPSO develops and oversees the administration of the Kentucky Post School Outcome Study. This is a longitudinal investigation of the post school outcomes of Kentucky youth with educational disabilities during the final year of high school and one year after high school exit. The KYPSO provides information regarding programs and practices to support secondary transition. The KYPSO is funded by the KDE. It is in the process of seeking additional external funding to conduct further research into factors predictive of post school success for Kentucky youth. Additional information is located through the following link:

http://www.kypso.org/home.aspx

The system of Leadership Networks in Kentucky was designed to support the quality implementation of the requirements set forth in Kentucky legislation passed in 2009, known as Senate Bill 1. The Networks' intention is to build the capacity of districts in the Commonwealth as they implement the KCAS, develop assessment literacy among all educators and work toward ensuring that every student is college and career ready. The vision for these networks is to ensure every school district in Kentucky has a knowledgeable and cohesive leadership team that guides the professional learning and practice of all administrators, teachers and staff, so that every student experiences highly effective teaching, learning and assessment practices in every classroom.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The KDE values shareholder input on targets and the revision of targets for the SPP/APR. The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) provides policy guidance to the KDE with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in Kentucky. The SAPEC consists of members appointed by the Governor. It includes of a variety of groups with related interests in students with disabilities. Members are parents of students with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, State and local education officials, administrators of programs for students with disabilities and outside agency representatives. The public is invited to forums when the SAPEC has its quarterly meetings.

The SAPEC has provided feedback to the KDE when setting targets for the SPP Indicators for FFY 13 through FFY 18 and looks at trends from historical data. Analysis of trend data for each SPP Indicator assisted the SAPEC in determining trajectories for future SPP targets. Additional information on the SAPEC is located on the KDE webpage at the following link:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/State-Advisory-Panel-for-Exceptional-Children.aspx

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The KDE publically reports the performance of local districts on the SPP/APR on the KDE webpage. The following link provides information regarding the public reporting of Section 618 Data, the SPP/APR and information regarding Kentucky's IDEA State Application. The information is located on the KDE webpage at the following link:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/Public-Reporting-of-District-Data.aspx

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			66.70%	71.30%	75.90%	80.50%	85.10%	85.10%	85.10%	74.30%
Data		63.90%	64.30%	67.34%	72.07%	72.79%	74.19%	73.21%	73.21%	74.27%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	76.90%	79.60%	79.60%	79.60%	79.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist in setting targets for the FFY 13 - FFY 18 SPP and APR.

For Indicator 1, KDE set targets based upon the Cohort Graduation Rate established in the KDE's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver; however, KDE consulted with SAPEC in aligning with the ESEA Waiver.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,579	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,645	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.75%	Calculate

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
2,579	3,645	74.27%	76.90%	70.75%

Explanation of Slippage

For FFY 14, the Indicator 1 target was set at 76.90%. The data for FFY 14 was 70.75%. Consequently, 6.15% slippage occured.

The KDE interviewed districts to determine reasons for the slippage. One reason provided was an increase in the number of students in the alternate assessment who receive an alternative diploma. Students receiving alternate diplomas do not count toward Kentucky's graduation rate.

DLS contacted KDE's Office of Assessment and Accountability (OAA) regarding the slippage. During FFY 2014, many Kentucky schools were required to extend their 14-15 School Year (SY) up to four weeks because of winter weather conditions. OAA believes the KDE data system counted some special education students with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma as general education students graduating with a diploma, if their IEPs expired prior to their graduation date due to the extended school year.

The DLS, in conjunction with the OAA, will determine if the extra school days during the 14-15 SY contributed to the decline in the graduation rate for students with disabilities. If the extra days were the reason for the slippag, DLS will develop an action plan, so an extended school year willl not result in a future decrease in the graduation rate for students with disabilties.

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time ninth graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards. It does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Kentucky schools must provide students with disabilities the opportunity and necessary instructional supports and accommodations to progress through a course of study leading to a diploma. Students with disabilities who earn the required high school credits through successful completion of content area and elective course work are awarded a regular diploma. The conditions that tudents with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma are the same as the conditions of students without disabilities.

The KDE identifies the minimum credits required for graduation. School districts set their local requirements in their district graduation policy (704 KAR 3:305).

http://www.lrc.ky.gov/kar/704/003/305.htm

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			5.08%	4.60%	3.84%	2.83%	2.71%	2.19%	2.19%	2.71%
Data		5.48%	5.00%	4.24%	3.23%	3.10%	2.59%	2.71%	2.71%	2.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.51%	2.31%	2.11%	1.91%	1.71%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13 - FFY 18.

The KDE consults with the SAPEC regarding progress toward meeting the targets on an annual basis. For Indicator 2, the KDE aligned with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver and set its targets based upon the trajectories established in the KDE's Strategic Delivery Plans. The KDE consulted with SAPEC in aligning to the ESEA waiver and in using KDE trajectories in estasblishing targets.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Custom numerator header.	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
501	24,440	2.70%	2.51%	2.05%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

☑ Change numerator description in data table

Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

As set forth in the measurement table, the KDE chose Option 2 in determining the dropout rate for Kentucky. Option 2 allows the state to use the same data source and measurement used to report in the FFY 13-14 APR.

According to the federal definition adopted by the Kentucky Board of Education, a **dropout** is an individual who:

1. Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year;

2. Was not enrolled before October 1 of the current school year;

3. Has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district approved educational program such as a GED or Alternative High School Diploma pursuant to an Individualized Education Program (IEP); and

4. Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transferred to another Kentucky public school district, private school, state or district approved education program or moved out of state or country; (b) temporarily absent due to suspension; or (c) deceased.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			45.00%	47.00%	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%	54.00%	54.00%	14.49%
Data		45.50%	45.50%	47.00%	58.62%	63.79%	57.47%	21.20%	21.20%	14.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	23.04%	31.59%	40.14%	48.69%	57.25%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original SPP. Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13- FFY 18.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

(●) Yes ( ) No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

( ) AYP (●) AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
175	149	84	14.49%	23.04%	56.38%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.79%
	B Grade 4	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.77%
	C Grade 5	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.70%
	D Grade 6	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.66%
	E Grade 7	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.69%
	F Grade 8	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.64%
	G HS	2013	Target ≥										98.00%
			Data										98.58%
Math	A Grade 3	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.81%
	B Grade 4	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.77%
	C Grade 5	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.69%
	D Grade 6	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.64%
	E Grade 7	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.63%
	F Grade 8	2013	Target ≥										99.00%
			Data										99.60%
	G HS	2013	Target ≥										98.00%
			Data										98.18%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	**A ≥** Grade 3	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	G ≥ HS	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	**A ≥** Grade 3	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
	G ≥ HS	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the origninal State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist in determiing targets for the FFY 13 - FFY 18.

Kentucky has revised Indicator 3B targets, baseline, and method of reporting to align with the Kentucky Unbridled Learning Assessment and Accountability System. The SAPEC provided feedback on the approval of the alignment of the participation rate for students with disabilities to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver and all students in Kentucky.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	7,504	7,500	99.79%	99.00%	99.95%
B Grade 4	6,993	6,992	99.77%	99.00%	99.99%
C Grade 5	6,543	6,539	99.70%	99.00%	99.94%
D Grade 6	6,193	6,186	99.66%	99.00%	99.89%
E Grade 7	5,587	5,582	99.69%	99.00%	99.91%
F Grade 8	5,678	5,666	99.64%	99.00%	99.79%
G HS	5,014	4,930	98.58%	98.00%	98.32%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	7,504	7,500	99.81%	99.00%	99.95%
B Grade 4	6,993	6,992	99.77%	99.00%	99.99%
C Grade 5	6,543	6,539	99.69%	99.00%	99.94%
D Grade 6	6,193	6,186	99.64%	99.00%	99.89%
E Grade 7	5,587	5,582	99.63%	99.00%	99.91%
F Grade 8	5,678	5,666	99.60%	99.00%	99.79%
G HS	3,844	3,784	98.18%	98.00%	98.44%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Kentucky School Report Card:

http://applications.education.ky.gov/SRC/

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2013	Target ≥										41.40%
			Data										35.28%
	B Grade 4	2013	Target ≥										41.40%
			Data										33.28%
	C Grade 5	2013	Target ≥										41.40%
			Data										31.53%
	D Grade 6	2013	Target ≥										33.50%
			Data										23.63%
	E Grade 7	2013	Target ≥										33.50%
			Data										24.70%
	F Grade 8	2013	Target ≥										33.50%
			Data										18.98%
	G HS	2013	Target ≥										29.00%
			Data										15.48%
Math	A Grade 3	2013	Target ≥										35.90%
			Data										26.22%
	B Grade 4	2013	Target ≥										35.90%
			Data										27.95%
	C Grade 5	2013	Target ≥										35.90%
			Data										26.75%
	D Grade 6	2013	Target ≥										32.10%
			Data										19.36%
	E Grade 7	2013	Target ≥										32.10%
			Data										17.29%
	F Grade 8	2013	Target ≥										32.10%
			Data										15.41%
	G HS	2013	Target ≥										28.90%
			Data										12.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	48.80%	56.10%	63.40%	70.70%	78.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	48.80%	56.10%	63.40%	70.70%	78.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	48.80%	56.10%	63.40%	70.70%	78.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	41.80%	50.10%	58.50%	66.80%	75.10%
	E ≥ Grade 7	41.80%	50.10%	58.50%	66.80%	75.10%
	F ≥ Grade 8	41.80%	50.10%	58.50%	66.80%	75.10%
	G ≥ HS	37.90%	45.80%	55.70%	63.70%	71.70%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	43.90%	51.90%	60.00%	68.00%	76.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	43.90%	51.90%	60.00%	68.00%	76.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	43.90%	51.90%	60.00%	68.00%	76.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	40.60%	49.10%	57.60%	66.10%	74.60%
	E ≥ Grade 7	40.60%	49.10%	57.60%	66.10%	74.60%
	F ≥ Grade 8	40.60%	49.10%	57.60%	66.10%	74.60%
	G ≥ HS	37.80%	46.10%	55.60%	63.60%	71.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13 - FFY 18.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

	score and a proficiency was assigned				
A Grade 3	7,484	2,573	35.28%	48.80%	34.38%
B Grade 4	6,984	2,210	33.28%	48.80%	31.64%
C Grade 5	6,527	1,972	31.53%	48.80%	30.21%
D Grade 6	6,174	1,454	23.63%	41.80%	23.55%
E Grade 7	5,571	1,186	24.70%	41.80%	21.29%
F Grade 8	5,645	1,035	18.98%	41.80%	18.33%
G HS	4,832	795	15.48%	37.90%	16.45%

Explanation of Group B Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the understanding of key components each year. As reading tasks becomes more complex in the later grades, this deep understanding is fundamental to student success.

As with any changes, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12 were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves, the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only improve performance for students with disabilities, but will increase teacher capacity in providing quality instruction. Although the SSIP is focused on math interventions, the tools and coaching teachers are receiving will be used in all content areas.

Explanation of Group C Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for ELA and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the understanding of key components each year. As reading tasks becomes more complex in the later grades, this deep understanding is fundamental to their success.

As with any new implementation, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12

were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only reduce the proficiency gaps for students with disabilities but will increase teacher capacity to provide quality instruction. Although the SSIP is focused on math interventions, the tools and coaching teachers are receiving will be used in all content areas.

Explanation of Group E Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for ELA and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the understanding of key components each year. As reading tasks becomes more complex in the later grades, this deep understanding is fundamental to student success.

As with any changes, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12 were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves, the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only reduce the proficiency gaps for students with disabilities but will increase teacher capacity to provide quality instruction. Although the SSIP is focused on math interventions, the tools and coaching teachers are receiving will be used in all content areas.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	7,487	1,943	26.22%	43.90%	25.95%
B Grade 4	6,985	1,734	27.95%	43.90%	24.82%
C Grade 5	6,529	1,542	26.75%	43.90%	23.62%
D Grade 6	6,174	1,046	19.36%	40.60%	16.94%
E Grade 7	5,569	808	17.29%	40.60%	14.51%

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
F Grade 8	5,647	843	15.41%	40.60%	14.93%
G HS	3,713	517	12.70%	37.80%	13.92%

Explanation of Group B Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for ELA and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the conceptual understanding of key components each year. As problem solving becomes more complex in the later grades, this conceptual understanding is fundamental to student success.

As with any change, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12 were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels. In the lower grades, students can be successful with following some procedural steps to solve problems. As these problems become more complex, *understanding* the steps becomes vital. This lack of conceptual understanding would account for the slippage.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves, the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only fill the gaps for students, but will increase teacher capacity to provide quality instruction.

Explanation of Group C Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for ELA and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the conceptual understanding of key components each year. As problem solving becomes more complex in the later grades, this conceptual understanding is fundamental to student success.

As with any change, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12 were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels. In the lower grades, students can be successful with following some procedural steps to solve problems. As these problems become more complex, *understanding* the steps becomes vital. This lack of conceptual understanding would account for the slippage.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves, the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only fill the gaps for students, but will increase teacher capacity to provide quality instruction.

Explanation of Group D Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for ELA and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the conceptual understanding of key components each year. As problem solving becomes more complex in the later grades, this conceptual understanding is fundamental to student success.

As with any change, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12 were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels. In the lower grades, students can be successful with following some procedural steps to solve problems. As these problems become more complex, *understanding* the steps becomes vital. This lack of conceptual understanding would account for the slippage.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves, the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only fill the gaps for students, but will increase teacher capacity to provide quality instruction.

Explanation of Group E Slippage

The Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) for ELA and Mathematics were implemented statewide in the 11-12 school year. At that time, the statewide assessment was aligned to the KCAS. KDE now has four years of data. The attachment of data trend lines shows consistency in the scores between students with disabilities and all students in the state.

The KCAS are designed to provide students with instruction concentrated at a deeper understanding of core concepts. The KCAS build on the conceptual understanding of key components each year. As problem solving becomes more complex in the later grades, this conceptual understanding is fundamental to student success.

As with any change, there is a transition period. Students who began with KCAS in Kindergarten in 11-12 were in grade three for the 14-15 school year. Therefore, students in grades 4-8 did not have the full implementation of KCAS through all grade levels. In the lower grades, students can be successful with following some procedural steps to solve problems. As these problems become more complex, *understanding* the steps becomes vital. This lack of conceptual understanding would account for the slippage.

Added to the lack of KCAS implementation in the early grades for these older students, is the learning curve for teachers in implementing core instruction and interventions aligned to KCAS. As teacher pedagogy improves, the level of student attainment should increase.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on implementing useable interventions with fidelity. This will not only fill the gaps for students, but will increase teacher capacity to provide quality instruction.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Kentucky School Report Card:

http://applications.education.ky.gov/SRC/

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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**
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 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.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			9.04%	7.95%	6.82%	5.68%	4.55%	3.41%	2.27%	2.29%
Data		11.23%	9.04%	7.38%	7.39%	7.39%	0.56%	0.56%	0.56%	0.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.29%	1.71%	1.71%	1.14%	1.14%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13 - FFY 18.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	175	0.57%	2.29%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- (selected) Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For the Measurement, a Kentucky district is found to have a "significant discrepancy" under Indicator 4A if the following two criteria are met:

A. The district suspends/expels students with disabilities for greater than 10 days during a school year at a rate that is three times or greater than the *statewide rate* for these types of removals that year, and

B. The district has at least ten students with disabilities who are subject to out-of school removals for greater than ten days

KDE annually calculates a *statewide rate* of out-of-school removals greater than 10 days for students with disabilities, using data obtained through the Kentucky Student Information System (KSIS). This rate is based on the total number of Kentucky students with disabilities subject to out-of-school removals greater than 10 days, divided by the total number of children with disabilities within the state. A similar rate is calculated for each individual school district in the state, based on its local discipline data and count of students with disabilities.
In summary, Kentucky defines significant discrepancy as a rate that is three times greater than a specified comparison rate (the statewide rate). Using this definition, Kentucky determines a district to have a significant discrepancy for this indicator when its rate of out-of–school removals (suspension/ expulsion greater than ten days of students with disabilities) is three times or more the statewide rate of these types of removals. In addition, districts must suspend more than ten students with a disability for greater than ten days to meet the criteria for significant discrepancy.

"N Size": Kentucky uses a minimum "n" size of ten or more students with a disability enrolled in the district. No districts were excluded from the calculation, based on the "n" size requirement.

For FFY 2014, using 2013-14 data, twenty-five districts of 175 had discrepancies that were three times or more than the state rate and met the first of two criteria for significant discrepancy. Of those twenty-five, no district also met the second criteria for significant discrepancy – that of suspending/ expelling ten or more students with disabilities for greater than ten days. Therefore, no Kentucky district met both criteria for determining significant discrepancy.
The state average comparison rate in Kentucky is very low at
.08%. Of the 25 districts exceeding the state rate, 15 districts suspended only one student for more than 10 days in the scho

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state average comparison rate in Kentucky is very low at
.08%. Of the 25 districts exceeding the state rate, 15 districts suspended only one student
for more than 10 days in the school year; five of those districts suspended 2 students
for more than 10 days in the school year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Based on 13-14 data, no Kentucky districts were found to have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for student with IEPs. Therefore, no review is warranted, as no districts were cited for non-compliance with Indicator 4A.

- [x] The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- [ ] The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
  - [ ] The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

    Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
  - [x] The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 13, one Kentucky district was found in non-compliance with Indicator 4A. That non-compliance has been corrected, and verified as follows:

In October 2014, a KDE team conducted a four-day on-site visit to the one district with previous Indicator 4A non-compliance. The purpose of the visit was to verify district reporting and documentation around the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) implementation and demonstration of required changes in discipline policies, procedures and practices.

The on-site visit included reviews of the following systemic and individual student issues:

- randomly selected, individual IEPs of students suspended greater than ten days
- review of extensive documentation of all activities specified by the previous and extensive CAP
- on-site attendance at district-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) training of all high-suspension high schools
- review of root cause analysis profiles of each high-suspension high school, detailed analysis of individual school progress with national PBIS trainer
- attendance at monthly District Leadership Data Review Team Meeting
- demonstration and review of new district data system
- review of manifestation determination meetings procedures and records
- review of new Student Code of Conduct and special education discipline policies and procedures for students with disabilities

The KDE staff have monitored and provided TA to the one district for three years and had ongoing discussions with district leadership regarding the following:

- district-wide initiatives to regularly review discipline data at the highest levels of district and school administration
- implementation of early flagging systems for students who are beginning to fail, increase culturally responsive instruction and discipline practices
- implementation of PBIS district-wide in all schools, with over sixty district schools currently receiving ongoing job-embedded professional learning around PBIS
- integration of restorative justice concepts into routine discipline practices
- provision of training to all administrators in Admission and Release Committee (ARC) meeting routines and proactive use of manifestation determination analysis and problem solving for students with over five days of suspension
- provision of IEP/specially designed instruction (SDI) training to teachers focused on how to incorporate behavior and social skill instruction
- brokerage of early behavioral health services for students in trauma

The records of individual students cited from the previous year were verified as corrected of all individual instances of non-compliance. The KDE also reviewed the district's suspension data for the 13-14 SY and found the district no longer has a significant discrepancy under Indicator 4A.

Based on the district's compliance with all systemic CAP provisions, the review of student records in randomly selected folders of recently suspended students and the 13-14 suspension data showing the one district no longer has significant discrepancy under Indicator 4A, the district is now in compliance with both prongs of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Therefore, no district in Kentucky currently has a significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A, and all FFY 13 findings of non-compliance are verified as corrected.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As noted above, in October 2014, the KDE on-site team reviewed the records of individual students cited from the previous year (SY 12-13), the records of all students suspended in the ensuing year (SY 13-14) and the randomly chosen records of students recently suspended up to five days in the next school year to date (SY 14-15). The records of individual students cited were verified corrected of all individual instances of non-compliance, consistent with Prong One of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*. Random record reviews indicated that policies and practices had changed and were in compliance with the disciplinary requirements of IDEA.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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**
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 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.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.60%	0.56%	0.56%	0.56%	0.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	175	0.57%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For the Measurement, a Kentucky district is found to have a significant discrepancy under Indicator 4B if both of the following two criteria are met:

A. The district suspends/expels students with disabilities in any racial or ethnic category for greater than ten days during a school year at a rate that is three times or greater than the annual statewide rate for these types of removals for all Kentucky students with disabilities that year, and

B. The district has at least 10 students with disabilities in that racial or ethnic category who are subject to out-of school removals for greater than 10 days in the school year.

In summary, Kentucky determines a district to have a significant discrepancy for this indicator when its rate of out-of-school removals (greater than ten days a year of students with disabilities) for a specific racial or ethnic category is three times or more the statewide rate for these types of removals. In addition, districts must suspend more than 10 students with a disability of that race/ ethnicity for greater than 10 days to meet the criteria for significant discrepancy.

The statewide rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10
days in a year of Kentucky students with IEPs is currently very low, at .08%.
Many districts in Kentucky are very small and
rural. If one student is suspended for greater than 10 days, it often causes the district rate to exceed the state average compari
In these small districts, the number of students with Individual Education Programs (IEPs) in any given racial or ethnic category are often very small. These small numbers can compromise the validity of risk ratio data and make it difficult to protect the identity of individual students in the process of public reporting, unless a minimum "N" size is employed as a criteria.
If a district is found to have a significant discrepancy in a particular racial or ethnic category, the KDE will review the district's policies, procedures, and practices. The KDE then assesses whether the policies, procedures and practices contributed to the significant discrepancy, by not complying with IDEA requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards.
The following number of districts met the first criteria listed above, by having a discrepancy in a race/ethnicity category that was three or more times the low state suspension rate of .08% for all Kentucky students with disabilities:

- 25 districts had a significant discrepancy for the "White" category
- Six districts had a significant discrepancy for the "Black" category
- One district had a significant discrepancy for the "Hispanic" category
- Zero districts had a significant discrepancy for the "Asian" category
- Zero districts had a significant discrepancy for the "Native American" category
- Zero districts had a significant discrepancy for the "Pacific Islander" category
- Two districts had a significant discrepancy for the "Multiple" category

However, of those districts listed, no district met the second criteria required for being determined to rise to the level of significant discrepancy due to also having at least ten students in the specific race/ethnicity subgroup who were subject to disciplinary removal for greater than ten days in a school year. Therefore, no district in Kentucky met both criteria for determining that a significant discrepancy currently exists in the district for Indicator 4B.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Indicator 4B data from 13-14 indicate no Kentucky school districts currently have a significant discrepancy, by race or

ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 13, based on 12-13 data, only one Kentucky district was cited for non-compliance with Indicator 4B. That non-compliance has now been corrected and verified as follows:

In October 14, a KDE team conducted a four day on-site visit to the district to verify district reporting and documentation around the two -year Corrective Action Plan (CAP) implementation and demonstration of required changes in discipline policies, procedures and practices.

The KDE staff reviewed individual student records and evaluated systemic progress on the extensive CAP activities assigned/continued from the previous year. Staff reviewed the records of individual students cited from the previous year (SY 12-13), the records of all students suspended in the ensuing school year since the last November 2013 visit (based on SY 13-14 data), and the records of students recently suspended up to five days in the current school year (SY 14-15).

The KDE's random review of records of students who had been suspended since the November 2013 visit verified the records were in compliance with the disciplinary requirements of IDEA, indicating positive changes in policies, procedures and practices had occurred.

The district currently maintains discipline policies and procedures which fully comply with IDEA. In an effort to strengthen district practices, the district has adopted new discipline policies and procedures regarding students with disabilities, which are more stringent than federal requirements. The district currently requires most procedural safeguards, including a team meeting, problem analysis, manifestation determination and behavior interventions at five days of suspension, in an effort to prevent students from reaching 10 or more days of suspension.

The on-site visit included reviews of the following:

- randomly selected, individual IEP student records of students suspended greater than 10 days
- review of extensive documentation of all activities specified by the extensive 10-page CAP
- on-site attendance at district-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) training of all high-suspension high schools
- review of root cause analysis profiles of each high-suspension high school, a meeting with the national PBIS trainer which detailed analysis of progress of individual schools
- attendance at monthly District Leadership Data Review Team Meeting
- team demonstration and review of new district data system
- review of manifestation determination meetings, procedures and records

- review of new Student Code of Conduct and special education discipline policies and procedures for students with disabilities

The KDE staff have monitored and had ongoing discussions with district leadership regarding the following systemic initiatives and CAP activities:

- district-wide initiatives to regularly review discipline data at the highest levels of district and school administration
- implementation of early flagging systems for students who are beginning to fail
- increase in district wide professional development regarding culturally responsive instruction and discipline practices
- implementation of PBIS district-wide in all schools, with over 60 district schools currently receiving ongoing job-embedded professional learning around PBIS
- integration of restorative justice concepts into routine discipline practices and PBIS training
- provision of training to all administrators in Admission and Release Committee (ARC) meeting routines and proactive use of manifestation determination analysis and problem solving for students with over five days of suspension
- provision of IEP/specially designed instruction (SDI) training to teachers focused on how to incorporate behavior and social skill instruction
- brokerage of early behavioral health services for students in trauma who need them

The KDE also reviewed the district's suspension data for the 13-14 SY and found the district no longer has a significant discrepancy under Indicator 4A.

Based on the district's compliance with all systemic CAP provisions, the review of randomly selected companion folders of recently suspended students and the 13-14 suspension data showing the district no longer has significant discrepancy under Indicator 4A or 4B, the KDE has a reasonable confidence that the district is now in compliance with both the systemic and individual student prongs of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In October 2014, the KDE on-site team reviewed student records of all previously cited individual students (associated with previous non-compliance) to verify that all individual cases of non-compliance were corrected. Staff reviewed the records of individual students cited from the previous year (SY 2012-2013), the records of all students suspended in the ensuing school year since the last November 2013 visit (based on SY 13-14 data), and the records of students suspended up to five days in the SY 14-15 school year. The individual student records had been corrected and are now in compliance with IDEA.

The KDE verified that Prong One of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02* has been satisfied, based on the district's correction of all individual instances of non-compliance.

Based on the district's compliance with all systemic CAP provisions, the review of randomly selected companion folders of recently suspended individual students and the 13-14 SY suspension data showing the district no longer has significant discrepancy under Indicator 4A or 4B, the KDE has reasonable confidence that the district is now in compliance with both prongs of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. **Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
B. **Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
C. **In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			63.00%	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	71.80%
		Data		64.33%	66.83%	68.69%	69.63%	70.80%	71.37%	71.35%	71.80%	72.31%
B	2005	Target ≤			11.50%	11.40%	11.20%	11.10%	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	8.70%
		Data		11.09%	10.25%	9.93%	9.84%	9.52%	9.16%	8.88%	8.73%	8.43%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.21%	2.15%	2.12%	2.05%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	1.90%
		Data		2.21%	2.24%	2.09%	2.09%	1.85%	1.93%	1.93%	1.90%	1.86%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.80%	71.80%	71.80%	71.80%	71.80%
Target B ≤	8.70%	8.70%	8.70%	8.70%	8.70%
Target C ≤	1.90%	1.90%	1.90%	1.90%	1.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13- FFY 18.

The KDE staff and the SPP/APR team discussed targets and analyzed the feedback provided by the SAPEC. KDE consulted with the SAPEC again in November 2014 and January 2015 to discuss the research gathered in answering questions asked of the panel. Kentucky's data around least restrictive environments has historically exceeded the national average for students participating in general education class settings for 80% or moreof the school day.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	80,826	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	59,128	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,642	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	460	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	337	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	548	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the	59,128	80,826	72.31%	71.80%	73.15%

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
regular class 80% or more of the day					
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,642	80,826	8.43%	8.70%	8.22%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,345	80,826	1.86%	1.90%	1.66%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. **Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and**
B. **Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									63.30%	63.30%
		Data								63.36%	64.94%	65.10%
B	2011	Target ≤									6.81%	6.81%
		Data								6.81%	5.04%	4.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%
Target B ≤	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original State Performance Plan (SPP). Feedback was provided and used to assist the KDE in determining targets for FFY 13- FFY 18.

The SAPEC and the KDE determined that the data was still developing and, until a trajectory of results could be determined, the data need to stabilize and be analyzed over a longer period of time. Targets will be reviewed as data is collected in future SPP/APRs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,994	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	11,240	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	606	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	93	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	5	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	11,240	16,994	65.10%	64.00%	66.14%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	704	16,994	4.63%	6.00%	4.14%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2013	Target ≥						56.00%	72.00%	81.00%	82.00%	49.29%
		Data					68.10%	82.10%	84.00%	84.00%	88.00%	49.29%
A2	2013	Target ≥						35.00%	50.00%	60.00%	61.00%	39.11%
		Data					39.70%	57.80%	68.00%	40.00%	64.00%	39.11%
B1	2013	Target ≥						57.00%	64.00%	81.00%	82.00%	67.42%
		Data					62.70%	64.70%	87.00%	72.00%	74.00%	67.42%
B2	2013	Target ≥						35.00%	48.00%	58.00%	59.00%	39.85%
		Data					35.50%	52.60%	72.00%	28.00%	30.00%	39.85%
C1	2013	Target ≥						49.00%	70.00%	81.00%	82.00%	50.67%
		Data					31.70%	83.90%	86.00%	84.00%	85.00%	50.67%
C2	2013	Target ≥						34.00%	50.00%	62.00%	63.00%	35.67%
		Data					27.60%	60.90%	70.00%	35.00%	57.00%	35.67%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	49.30%	49.30%	50.00%	50.00%	50.50%
Target A2 ≥	39.20%	39.20%	40.00%	40.00%	40.50%
Target B1 ≥	67.40%	67.40%	68.00%	68.00%	68.50%
Target B2 ≥	39.90%	39.90%	40.50%	40.50%	41.00%
Target C1 ≥	50.70%	50.70%	51.50%	51.50%	52.00%
Target C2 ≥	35.70%	35.70%	36.50%	36.50%	37.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new SPP targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of

each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original SPP. Feedback was provided and used to assist the KDE in determining targets for FFY 13 - FFY 18.

New algorithms were used during FFY 13 to more accurately calculate a child's level of development, which means that, while the scores for FFY 13 are lower, they are more accurate than in previous years. A new baseline and targets were established to reflect the more accurate data calcualtion. The SAPEC was consulted and agreed with the changes.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	6051.00

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	215.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2721.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1161.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1147.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	807.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2308.00	5244.00	49.29%	49.30%	44.01%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1954.00	6051.00	39.11%	39.20%	32.29%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

Discussion of Summary Statements and progress data for FFY 14: This is the ninth year of data collection for SPP Indicator 7 in Kentucky and the fourth year data have been collected from all 173 districts in the state. (Note: Indicator 7 data are not collected from the Kentucky School for the Blind or Kentucky School for the Deaf.) This is the second year for modified analysis algorithms used in calculating growth. FFY 14 data reflect the following: 1) all preschool districts are now participating in student progress measures; 2) many districts submitted complete demographic and assessment data; 3) rates of data completion remained consistent; and 4) continuation of the modified analysis algorithms to calculate growth.

For FFY 14, Summary Statement 1, the percentage of students who made significant improvement during their time in preschool was 44.0% for Outcome A. This figure is lower than the data from FFY 2013. Analysis of the decrease and review of current preschool practices indicated the following possibilities for the decrease:

- heavier focus on academic outcomes and school readiness assessments
- increase in assessment training opportunities leading to more accurate assessment and analyses practices by educators, which resulted in better identification of students

- program evaluation instruments that emphasize student-choice/ small group activities rather than embedded directly instructed small groups
- changes in preschool scheduling, including a reduction in days of operation from four days a week to two days a week in 10 districts. (Service hours were not decreased.)
- reduction in program staffing to the minimum 20:2 child to adult ratio, consequently challenging staff to adequately meet the global needs of students, including the social, emotional and behavior needs

FFY 14 data include *N* = 5,244 (the denominator), which is consistent with the number of students with complete data from FFY 13. The data included required assessments for students with compliance from all districts. Students who did not have two complete points of data, who did not receive services for at least six months or who had less than 75% complete assessments were not included in analyses.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress: Several steps were taken this year to improve assessment and data entry reliability.

- Early Learning Leadership Networks (ELLN) and Regional Training Center (RTC) teams continued to provide technical assistance (TA) to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry, and increased reliability of data.
- Recorded tutorials were maintained on the Kentucky Early Childhood Data System (KEDS) website, to allow 24/7 viewing of data entry procedures.
- The KEDS staff presented updates on the KEDS data entry process via a recorded webinar on the KDE website.
- Providers continued to be trained in data entry and reliability through face-to-face meetings, recorded tutorials, webinars, phone calls and emails.
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) documents were updated as needed to reflect changes in policy and in response to teacher and administrator questions.
- The KEDS maintained district verification of all student demographic fields, to increase accuracy of data received.
- Additional steps were taken to review all data prior to inclusion in analyses, including a careful review of prior years' assessments to ensure complete assessments were included, as well as computer and staff verification of scoring rules for each assessment.

Improvement activities: The KDE and partnering early childhood agencies (including but not limited to RTCs, KEDS and the Governor's Office of Early Childhood) propose the following improvement activities targeted to improving the quality of programs and services to improve student outcomes. The strategies listed are existing in nature or to be implemented beginning in the 2014 - 2015 preschool academic year (see note).

- The KDE will continue to conduct Preschool Program Reviews. Every district is included in a five-year cohort cycle. During each cycle, a KDE Preschool Consultant, along with members of their respective district's RTC, will evaluate the district based on evidence submitted within a timeline. Districts must submit proof of compliance with each state-funded preschool regulation. Evidence is submitted online. Consultants review items that include, but are not limited to, photos, teacher and assistant schedules, facility purchase orders, *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised* (ECERS-r) scores obtained by RTCs, program policies and procedures, intervention protocol, flyers and information from family-oriented activities and lesson plans.
- The RTCs and the KDE will partner to provide ELLN trainings. Trainings will continue to provide TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data. Content will also cover regionally-specified needs based on RTC information.
- The KDE will review and revise policies and procedures related to the Kentucky System of Intervention/Response to Intervention (KSI/RtI) practices currently in place.
- The KDE will analyze KSI/RtI data from FFY 14 to disaggregate specific information on social, emotional and behavior interventions. This information will be used to inform early childhood partners on current trends and possible causes, and establish corrective action plans if needed.

- The Governor's Office of Early Childhood has created a webinar centered on families. This webinar, entitled "Strengthening Families," is a free, three-hour web-based personal development resource designed to help all shareholders in early childhood meet the needs of young children.
- RTCs will continue to provide a diverse selection of trainings and resources that cover social and emotional domain growth.

These trainings include:

- Kentucky's Initiative in Social Emotional Development (KISSED). KISSED utilizes a team-based format to train early childhood educators and support staff in facilitating social/emotional development in young children. Participants gain both knowledge and skills necessary to the differing needs of young children. Three levels of need and corresponding intervention comprise the focus of the training. The team problem-solving approach builds local capacity to gain insight into children's behavior. It also provides expertise to promote children's increased social competence in school and at home. KISSED is organized into four training modules. The training is open to all early childhood providers. It is often attended by professionals serving Early Head Start, Head Start, and child care locations.

- Second Step Curriculum: "Your youngest learners will benefit more from preschool and be better prepared for kindergarten with self-regulation and executive-function skills that help them pay attention, remember directions, and control their behavior." (http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step).

- Leader in Me: This is used in preschools, to empower students to take ownership of their own data and learning progress. http://www.theleaderinme.org/

- Community Early Childhood Council (CECC) Trainings

- Trainings offered on social-emotional development, milestones, adult-child interactions and Autism teams
- Summer conferences planned by the RTC with a strand of trainings that address behavior
- Nonviolent Seclusion and Restraint trainings—Safe Crisis Management
- RTC Lending Libraries that offer resources on social, emotional and behavior topics
- Preschool IEP Guidance Document with social/emotional present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLEP) examples. The document offers Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) members guidance on the information that should be/could be included in an Individual Education Program. (IEP). Examples of PLEPs and connecting goals are written in narrative form. The guidance documents were distributed at ELLN meetings in the fall.
- Observations in the classroom and, as needed, case-specific technical assistance. This includes assistance in creating and implementing behavior intervention plans (BIPs) and behavior management strategies.

[Note:] State-funded preschool programs in Kentucky operate on a different academic calendar than K - 12 programs. Historically, preschool begins two weeks after the K - 12 program and ends two-weeks prior. This allows for service providers to conduct two mandatory home visits within the year; enter, disaggregate and disseminate data collected for a variety of benchmarking purposes; and ensure daily operations are within the state regulations.

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Discussion of Summary Statements and progress data for FFY 14: This is the ninth year of data collection for SPP Indicator 7 in Kentucky and the fourth year data have been collected from all 173 districts in the state. (Note: Indicator 7 data are not collected from the Kentucky School for the Blind or Kentucky School for the Deaf.) This is the second year for modified analysis algorithms used in calculating growth. FFY 14 data reflect the following: 1) all preschool districts are now participating in student progress measures; 2) many districts submitted complete demographic and assessment data;

3) rates of data completion remained consistent; and, 4) continuation of the modified analysis algorithms to calculate growth.

For FFY 14, for Summary Statement 2, the percentage of students functioning within age expectations upon exit for all approved assessments was 32.3% for Outcome A. This figure is lower than in FY 2013. Analysis of thie decrease and review of current preschool practices indicated the following possibilities for the slippage:

- heavier focus on academic outcomes and school readiness assessments
- increase in assessment training opportunities leading to more accurate assessment and analyses practices by educators and therefore, improvement in student identification
- program evaluation instruments that emphasize student-choice/ small group activities rather than embedded directly instructed small groups
- changes in preschool scheduling including a reduction in days of operation from four days a week to two days a week in 10 districts. (Service hours were not decreased.)
- reduction in program staffing to the minimum 20:2 child to adult ratio, consequently challenging staff to adequately meet the global needs of students including the social, emotional and behavior needs.

FFY 14 data include *N* = 6,051 (the denominator), which is consistent with the number of students with complete data from FFY 13. The data included required assessments for students with compliance from all districts. Students who did not have two complete points of data, who did not receive services for at least six months or who had less than 75% complete assessments were not included in analyses.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress: Several steps were taken this year to improve assessment and data entry reliability.

- ELLN and RTC teams continued to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry, and increased reliability of data.
- Recorded tutorials were maintained on the KEDS website, to allow 24/7 viewing of data entry procedures.
- The KEDS staff presented updates on the KEDS data entry process via a recorded webinar on the KDE website.
- Providers continued to be trained in data entry and reliability through face-to-face meetings, recorded tutorials, webinars, phone calls and emails.
- FAQ documents were updated as needed to reflect changes in policy and in response to teacher and administrator questions.
- The KEDS maintained district verification of all student demographic fields, to increase accuracy of data received.
- Additional steps were taken to review all data prior to inclusion in analyses, including a careful review of prior years' assessments to ensure complete assessments were included, as well as computer and staff verification of scoring rules for each assessment.

Improvement activities: The KDE and partnering early childhood agencies (including but not limited to RTCs, KEDS and the Governor’s Office of Early Childhood) propose the following improvement activities targeted to improving the quality of programs and services to improve student outcomes. The strategies listed are existing in nature or to be implemented beginning in the 2014 - 2015 preschool academic year (see note).

- The KDE will continue to conduct Preschool Program Reviews. Every district is included in a five-year Cohort cycle. During each cycle, a KDE Preschool Consultant, along with members of their respective district’s RTC, will evaluate the district based on evidence submitted within a timeline. Districts must submit proof of compliance with each state-funded preschool regulation. Evidence is submitted online. Consultants review items that include, but are not limited to, photos, teacher and assistant schedules, facility purchase orders, *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised* (ECERS-r) scores obtained by RTCs, program policies and procedures, intervention protocol, flyers and information from family-oriented activities and lesson plans.

- The RTCs and the KDE will partner to provide ELLN trainings. Trainings will continue to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data. Content will also cover regionally-specified needs based on RTC information.
- The KDE will review and revise policies and procedures related to the Kentucky System of Intervention/Response to Intervention (KSI/RtI) practices currently in place.
- The KDE will analyze KSI/RtI data from FFY14 to disaggregate specific information on social, emotional and behavior interventions. This information will be used to inform early childhood partners on current trends and possible causes, and establish corrective action plans if needed.
- The Governor's Office of Early Childhood has created a webinar centered on families. This webinar, entitled "Strengthening Families," is a free, three-hour web-based personal development resource designed to help all shareholders in early childhood meet the needs of young children.
- RTCs will continue to provide a diverse selection of trainings and resources that cover social and emotional domain growth.

These trainings include:

- Kentucky's Initiative in Social Emotional Development (KISSED). KISSED utilizes a team-based format to train early childhood educators and support staff in facilitating social/emotional development in young children. Participants gain both knowledge and skills necessary to the differing needs of young children. Three levels of need and corresponding intervention comprise the focus of the training. The team problem-solving approach builds local capacity to gain insight into children's behavior. It also provides expertise to promote children's increased social competence in school and at home. KISSED is organized into four training modules. This training is open to all early childhood providers. It is often attended by professionals serving Early Head Start, Head Start, and child care locations.

- Second Step Curriculum: "Your youngest learners will benefit more from preschool and be better prepared for kindergarten with self-regulation and executive-function skills that help them pay attention, remember directions, and control their behavior." (http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step).

- Leader in Me: This is used in preschools to empower students to take ownership of their own data and learning progress. http://www.theleaderinme.org/

- Community Early Childhood Council (CECC) Trainings:

- Trainings offered on social-emotional development, milestones, adult-child interactions and Autism teams
- Summer conferences planned by the RTC with a strand of trainings that address behavior
- Nonviolent Seclusion and Restraint trainings—Safe Crisis Management
- RTC Lending Libraries that offer resources on social, emotional and behavior topics
- Preschool IEP Guidance Document with social/emotional present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLEP) examples . The guidance offers ARC members guidance on the information that should be/could be included in an IEP. Examples of PLEPs and connecting goals are written in narrative form. The document has been given out at ELLN meetings in the fall.
- Observations in the classroom and, as needed, case-specific technical assistance. This includes assistance in creating and implementing behavior intervention plans (BIPs) and behavior management strategies.

[Note:] State-funded preschool programs in Kentucky operate on a different academic calendar than K - 12 programs. Historically, preschool begins two weeks after the K-12 program and ends two-weeks prior. This allows for service providers to conduct two mandatory home visits within the year; enter, disaggregate and disseminate data collected for a variety of benchmarking purposes; and ensure daily operations are within the state regulations.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	124.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1691.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1902.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1472.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	862.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	3374.00	5189.00	67.42%	67.40%	65.02%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2334.00	6051.00	39.85%	39.90%	38.57%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Discussion of Summary Statements and progress data for FFY 14: This is the ninth year of data collection for SPP Indicator 7 in Kentucky and the fourth year data have been collected from all 173 districts in the state. (Note: Indicator 7 data are not collected from the Kentucky School for the Blind or Kentucky School for the Deaf.) This is the second year for modified analysis algorithms used in calculating growth.

FFY 14 data reflect the following: 1) all preschool districts are now participating in student progress measures; 2) many districts submitted complete demographic and assessment data; 3) rates of data completion remained consistent; and 4) continuation of the modified analysis algorithms to calculate growth.

For FFY 14, Summary Statement 1, the percentage of students who made significant improvement during their time in preschool was 65.0% for Outcome B. This percentage is lower than the percentage from FFY 2013. Analysis of the decre ase and review of current preschool practices indicated the following possibilities for the slippage:

- heavier focus on academic outcomes and school readiness assessments
- increase in assessment training opportunities leading to more accurate assessment and analyses practices by educators and better identification of students
- program evaluation instruments that emphasize student-choice/ small group activities rather than embedded directly instructed small groups
- changes in preschool scheduling, including a reduction in days of operation from four days a week to two days a week in 10 districts. (Service hours were not decreased.)
- reduction in program staffing to the minimum 20:2 child to adult ratio, which challenges staff to adequately meet the global needs of students, including communication and language development needs.

FFY 14 data include N = 5,189 (the denominator), which is consistent with the number of students with complete data from FFY 13. The data included required assessments for students with compliance from all districts. Students who did not have two complete points of data, who did not receive services for at least six months or who had less than 75% complete assessments were not included in analyses.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress: Several steps were taken this year to improve assessment and data entry reliability:

- the Kentucky Early Learning Leadership Network (ELLN) and the Kentucky Early Childhood Regional Training Centers (RTCs) teams continued to assist with TA to districts across the state on assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data
- recorded tutorials were maintained on the KEDS website to allow 24/7 viewing of data entry procedures
- the KEDS staff presented updates on the KEDS data entry process via a recorded webinar on the KDE website
- providers continued to be trained in data entry and reliability through face-to-face meetings, recorded tutorials, webinars, phone calls and emails
- FAQ documents were updated as needed to reflect changes in policy and in response to teacher and administrator questions
- the KEDS maintained district verification of all student demographic field, to increase accuracy of data received
- additional steps were taken to review all data prior to inclusion in analyses, including a careful review of prior years' assessments, to ensure complete assessments were included, as well as computer and staff verification of scoring rules for each assessment

Improvement activities: The KDE and partnering early childhood agencies (including but not limited to RTCs, KEDS and the Governor's Office of Early Childhood) propose the following activities targeted to improving the quality of programs and services to improve the student outcomes. The strategies listed are existing or to be implemented beginning in the 2014 - 2015 preschool academic year (see note).

- The KDE will continue to conduct Preschool Program Reviews. Every district is included in a five-year Cohort cycle. During each cycle, a KDE Preschool Consultant, along with members of their respective district's RTC, will evaluate the district based on evidence submitted within a timeline. Districts must submit proof of compliance with each state-funded preschool regulation. Evidence is submitted online. Consultants review items that include, but are not limited to, photos, teacher and assistant schedules, facility purchase orders, *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised* (ECERS-r) scores obtained by the RTCs, program policies and procedures, intervention protocol, flyers and information from family-oriented activities and lesson plans.
- RTCs and the KDE will partner to provide ELLN trainings. Trainings will continue to provide TA to districts across the state in the areas of assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data. Content will also cover regionally-specified needs based on RTC information.
- The KDE will review and revise policies and procedures related to the Kentucky System of Intervention/Response to Intervention (KSI/RtI) practices currently in place.
- The KDE will analyze KSI/RtI data from FFY14 to disaggregate specific information on communication interventions. This information will be used to inform early childhood partners on current trends and possible causes, and to establish corrective action plans if needed.
- The Governor's Office of Early Childhood has created a webinar centered on families. This webinar, entitled "Strengthening Families," is a free, three-hour web-based personal development resource designed to help all shareholders in early childhood meet the needs of young children.
- RTCs will continue to provide a diverse selection of trainings and resources that cover social and emotional domain growth.

These trainings include:

- Kentucky's Initiative in Social Emotional Development (KISSED) : KISSED utilizes a team-based format to train early childhood educators and support staff in facilitating social/emotional development in young children. Participants gain both knowledge and skills necessary to serve the differing needs of young children. Three levels of need and corresponding interventions comprise the focus of the training. The team problem-solving approach builds local capacity to gain insight into children's behavior. It also provides expertise to promote children's increased social competence in school and at home. KISSED is organized into four training modules. The training is open to all early childhood providers. It is often attended by professionals serving Early Head Start, Head Start and child care

locations.

• Second Step Curriculum: "Your youngest learners will benefit more from preschool and be better prepared for kindergarten with self-regulation and executive-function skills that help them pay attention, remember directions, and control their behavior." (http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step).

• Leader in Me: This is used in preschools to empower students to take ownership of their own data and learning progress. http://www.theleaderinme.org/

• Community Early Childhood Council (CECC) Trainings:

- Trainings offered on social-emotional development, milestones, adult-child interactions and Autism teams
- RTC Lending Libraries that offer resources on communication topics
- Preschool IEP Guidance Document with communication present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLEP) examples. The document offers Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) members guidance on information that should be/could be included in an IEP. Examples of PLEPs and connecting goals are written in narrative form. The guidance document was distributed at ELLN meetings in the fall of 2014
- Observations in the classroom and as needed, case-specific technical assistance

(Note): State-funded preschool programs in Kentucky operate on a different academic calendar than K - 12 programs. Historically, preschool begins two weeks after the K - 12 program and ends two-weeks prior. This allows for service providers to conduct two mandatory home visits within the year; enter, disaggregate and disseminate data collected for a variety of benchmarking purposes; and ensure daily operations are within the state regulations.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Discussion of Summary Statements and progress data for FFY 14: This is the ninth year of data collection for SPP Indicator 7 and the fourth year data have been collected from all 173 districts in the state. (Note: Indicator 7 data are not collected from the Kentucky School for the Blind or Kentucky School for the Deaf.) This is the second year for modified analysis algorithms used in calculating growth.

FFY 14 data reflect the following: 1) all preschool districts are now participating in student progress measures; 2) many districts submitted complete demographic and assessment data; 3) rates of data completion remained consistent; and, 4) continuation of the modified analysis algorithms to calculate growth.

For FFY 14, for Summary Statement 2, the percentage of students functioning within age expectations upon exit for all approved assessments was 38.6% for Outcome B. This figure is lower than data collected in FFY 2013. Analysis of the decrease and review of current preschool practices indicated the following possibilities for the slippage:

- heavier focus on academic outcomes and school readiness assessments
- increase in assessment training opportunities leading to more accurate assessment and analyses practices by educators and therefore, better identification of students
- program evaluation instruments that emphasize student-choice /small group activities rather than embedded directly instructed small groups
- changes in preschool scheduling including a reduction in days of operation from four days a week to two days a week in 10 districts. (Service hours were not decreased.)
- reduction in program staffing to the minimum 20:2 child to adult ratio, which challenges staff to adequately meet the global needs of students, including communication and language development needs

FFY 14 data include N = 6,051 (the denominator), which is consistent with the number of students with complete data from FFY 13. The data included required assessments for students with compliance from all districts. Students who did not have two complete points of data, who did not receive services for at least six months or who had less than 75%

complete assessments were not included in analyses.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress: Several steps were taken this year to improve assessment and data entry reliability.

- ELLN and RTC teams continued to assist with TA to districts across the state in assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data
- recorded tutorials were maintained on the KEDS website to allow 24/7 viewing of data entry procedures
- the KEDS staff presented updates on the KEDS data entry process via a recorded webinar on the KDE website
- providers continued to be trained in data entry and reliability through face-to-face meetings, recorded tutorials, webinars, phone calls and emails
- FAQ documents were updated as needed to reflect changes in policy and in response to teacher and administrator questions
- the KEDS maintained district verification of all student demographic fields to increase accuracy of data received
- additional steps were taken to review all data prior to inclusion in analyses, including a careful review of prior years' assessments, to ensure complete assessments were included, as well as computer and staff verification of scoring rules for each assessment

Improvement activities: The KDE and partnering early childhood agencies (including but not limited to RTCs, KEDS and the Governor's Office of Early Childhood) propose the following improvement activities targeted to improving the quality of programs and services to improve student outcomes. The strategies listed are existing in nature or were to be implemented beginning in the 2014 - 2015 preschool academic year (see note).

- The KDE will continue to conduct Preschool Program Reviews. Every district is included in a five-year Cohort cycle. During each cycle, a KDE Preschool Consultant, along with members of their respective district's RTC, will evaluate the district based on evidence submitted within a timeline. Districts must submit proof of compliance with each state-funded preschool regulation. Evidence is submitted online. Consultants review items that include, but are not limited to, photos, teacher and assistant schedules, facility purchase orders, *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised* (ECERS-r) scores obtained by RTCs, program policies and procedures, intervention protocol, flyers and information from family-oriented activities and lesson plans.
- RTCs and the KDE will partner to provide ELLN trainings. Trainings will continue to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data. Content will also cover regionally-specified needs based on RTC information.
- The KDE will review and revise policies and producers related to the Kentucky System of Intervention/Response to Intervention (KSI/RtI) practices currently in place.
- The KDE will analyze KSI/RtI data from FFY 14 to disaggregate specific information on communication interventions. This information will be used to inform early childhood partners on current trends and possible causes, and establish corrective action plans if needed.
- The Governor's Office of Early Childhood has created a webinar centered on families. This webinar, entitled "Strengthening Families," is a free, three-hour web-based personal development resource designed to help all shareholders in early childhood meet the needs of young children.
- RTCs will continue to provide a diverse selection of trainings and resources that cover social and emotional domain growth.

These trainings include:

- Kentucky's Initiative in Social Emotional Development (KISSED): KISSED utilizes a team-based format to train early childhood educators and support staff in facilitating social/emotional development in young children. Participants gain both knowledge and skills necessary to the differing needs of young children. Three levels of need and corresponding intervention comprise the focus of the training. The team problem solving approach builds local

capacity to gain insight into children's behavior. It also provides expertise to promote children's increased social competence in school and at home. KISSED is organized into four training modules. The training is open to all early childhood providers. It is often attended by professionals serving Early Head Start, Head Start and child care locations.

• Second Step Curriculum: "Your youngest learners will benefit more from preschool and be better prepared for kindergarten with self-regulation and executive-function skills that help them pay attention, remember directions, and control their behavior." (http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step).

• Leader in Me: This is used in preschools to empower students to take ownership of their own data and learning progress. http://www.theleaderinme.org/

- Community Early Childhood Council (CECC) Trainings:

- Trainings offered on social-emotional development, milestones, adult-child interactions and Autism teams
- RTC Lending Libraries that offer resources on communication topics
- Preschool IEP Guidance Document with communication present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLEP) examples. The document offers ARC members guidance on information that should be/could be included in an IEP. Examples of PLEPs and connecting goals are written in narrative form. The guidance document has been given out at ELLN meetings in the fall of 2014
- Observations in the classroom and as needed, case-specific technical assistance

(Note): State-funded preschool programs in Kentucky operate on a different academic calendar than K - 12 programs. Historically, preschool begins two weeks after the K - 12 program and ends two-weeks prior. This allows for service providers to conduct two mandatory home visits within the year; enter, disaggregate and disseminate data collected for a variety of benchmarking purposes; and ensure daily operations are within the state regulations.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	386.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3157.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1094.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	861.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	553.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1955.00	5498.00	50.67%	50.70%	35.56%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1414.00	6051.00	35.67%	35.70%	23.37%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Discussion of Summary Statements and progress data for FFY 14: This is the ninth year of data collection for SPP Indicator 7 in Kentucky and the fourth year data have been collected from all 173 districts in the state. (Note: Kentucky

School for the Blind and Kentucky School for the Deaf are not included in the data collection process.) This is the second year for modified analysis algorithms used in calculating growth. FFY 14 data reflect the following: 1) all preschool districts are now participating in student progress measures; 2) many districts submitted complete demographic and assessment data; 3) rates of data completion remained consistent; and 4) continuation of the modified analysis algorithms to calculate growth.

For FFY 14, Summary Statement 1, the percentage of students who made significant improvement during their time in preschool was 35.6% for Outcome C, which was a decrease from the FFY 2013 data. Analysis of the decrease and review of current preschool practices indicated the following possibilities for the slippage:

- heavier focus on academic outcomes and school readiness assessments
- increase in assessment training opportunities leading to more accurate assessment and analyses practices by educators and therefore, better identification of students
- program evaluation instruments that emphasize student-choice/ small group activities rather than embedded directly instructed small groups
- changes in preschool scheduling including a reduction in days of operation from four days a week to two days a week in 10 districts. (Service hours were not decreased.)
- reduction in program staffing to the minimum 20:2 child to adult ratio, consequently challenging staff to adequately meet the global needs of students, including the social, emotional and behavior needs.

FFY 14 data includes *N* = 5,498 (the denominator), which is consistent with the number of students with complete data from FFY 13. The denominator included required assessments for students with compliance from all districts. Students who did not have two complete points of data, who did not receive services for at least six months or who had less than 75% complete assessments were not included in analyses.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress: Several steps were taken this year to improve assessment and data entry reliability:

- ELLN and RTC teams continued to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data
- recorded tutorials were maintained on the KEDS website to allow 24/7 viewing of data entry procedures
- the KEDS staff presented updates on the KEDS data entry process via a recorded webinar on the KDE website
- providers continued to be trained in data entry and reliability through face-to-face meetings, recorded tutorials, webinars, phone calls and emails
- FAQ documents were updated as needed to reflect changes in policy and in response to teacher and administrator questions
- the KEDS maintained district verification of all student demographic fields, to increase accuracy of data received
- additional steps were taken to review all data prior to inclusion in analyses, including a careful review of prior years' assessments to ensure complete assessments were included, as well as computer and staff verification of scoring rules for each assessment

Improvement activities: The KDE and partnering early childhood agencies (including, but not limited to, RTCs, KEDS and the Governor's Office of Early Childhood) propose the following improvement activities targeted to improving the quality of programs and services to improve student outcomes. The strategies listed are existing in nature or to be implemented beginning in the 2014 - 2015 preschool academic year (see note).

- The KDE will continue to conduct Preschool Program Reviews. Every district is included in a five-year Cohort cycle. During each cycle, a KDE Preschool Consultant, along with members of their respective district's RTC, will evaluate the district based on evidence submitted within a timeline. Districts must submit proof of compliance with each state-funded preschool regulation. Evidence is submitted online. Consultants review items that include, but are not limited

to, photos, teacher and assistant schedules, facility purchase orders, *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised* (ECERS-r) scores obtained by RTCs, program policies and procedures, intervention protocol, flyers and information from family-oriented activities and lesson plans.
- RTCs and the KDE will partner to provide ELLN trainings. Trainings will continue to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data. Content will also cover regionally-specified needs based on RTC information.
- The KDE will review and revise policies and procedures related to the Kentucky System of Intervention/Response to Intervention (KSI/RtI) practices currently in place.
- The KDE will analyze KSI/RtI data from FFY 14, to disaggregate specific information on communication interventions. This information will be used to inform early childhood partners on current trends and possible causes, and establish corrective action plans if needed.
- The Governor's Office of Early Childhood has created a webinar centered on families. This webinar, entitled "Strengthening Families," is a free, three-hour web-based personal development resource, designed to help all shareholders in early childhood meet the needs of young children.
- RTCs will continue to provide a diverse selection of trainings and resources that cover social and emotional domain growth.

These trainings include:

- Kentucky's Initiative in Social Emotional Development (KISSED): KISSED utilizes a team-based format to train early childhood educators and support staff in facilitating social/emotional development in young children. Participants gain both knowledge and skills necessary to the differing needs of young children. Three levels of need and corresponding intervention comprise the focus of the training. The team problem-solving approach builds local capacity to gain insight into children's behavior. It also provides expertise to promote children's increased social competence in school and at home. KISSED is organized into four training modules. This training is open to all early childhood providers. It is often attended by professionals serving Early Head Start, Head Start and child care locations.

• Second Step Curriculum: "Your youngest learners will benefit more from preschool and be better prepared for kindergarten with self- regulation and executive-function skills that help them pay attention, remember directions, and control their behavior." (http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step)

• Leader in Me: This is used in preschools to empower students to take ownership of their own data and learning progress. http://www.theleaderinme.org/

• Community Early Childhood Council (CECC) Trainings:

- Trainings offered on social-emotional development, milestones, adult-child interactions and Autism teams
- Summer conferences planned by the RTC with a strand of trainings that address behavior
- Nonviolent Seclusion and Restraint trainings—Safe Crisis Management
- RTC Lending Libraries that offer resources on social, emotional and behavior topics
- Preschool IEP Guidance Document with social/emotional present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLEP) examples The document offers Admissions and Release Committee (ARC) members guidance on information that should be/could be included in an IEP. Examples of PLEPs and connecting goals are written in narrative form. The guidance document was distributed at ELLN meetings in the fall.
- Observations in the classroom and as needed, case-specific technical assistance. This includes assistance in creating and implementing behavior intervention plans (BIPs) and behavior management strategies.

[Note:] State- funded preschool programs in Kentucky operate on a different academic calendar than K - 12 programs. Historically, preschool begins two weeks after the K - 12 program and ends two-weeks prior. This allows for service

providers to conduct two mandatory home visits within the year; enter, disaggregate and disseminate data collected for a variety of benchmarking purposes; and ensure daily operations are within the state regulations.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Discussion of Summary Statements and progress data for FFY 14: This is the ninth year of data collection for SPP Indicator 7 in Kentucky and the fourth year data have been collected from all 173 districts in the state. (Note: Kentucky School for the Blind and Kentucky School for the Deaf are not included in the data collection process.) This is the second year for modified analysis algorithms used in calculating growth. FFY14 data reflect the following: 1) all preschool districts are now participating in student progress measures; 2) many districts submitted complete demographic and assessment data; 3) rates of data completion remained consistent; and, 4) continuation of the modified analysis algorithms to calculate growth.

For FFY 14 Summary Statement 2, the percentage of students functioning within age expectations upon exit for all approved assessments was 23.4% for Outcome C. This figure is lower than the data from FFY 2013. Analysis and review of current preschool practices indicated the following possibilities for the slippage:

- heavier focus on academic outcomes and school readiness assessments
- increase in assessment training opportunities leading to more accurate assessment and analyses practices by educators and therefore, proper idnetification of more students
- program evaluation instruments that emphasize student-choice/ small group activities rather than embedded directly instructed small groups
- changes in preschool scheduling including a reduction in days of operation from four-days a week to two-days a week in 10 districts. (Service hours were not decreased.)
- reduction in program staffing to the minimum 20:2 child to adult ratio, consequently challenging staff to adequately meet the global needs of students, including the social, emotional and behavior needs.

FFY 14 data include *N* = 6,051 (the denominator), which is consistent with the number of students with complete data from FFY 13. The denominator included required assessments for students with compliance from all districts. Students who did not have two complete points of data, who did not receive services for at least six months or who had less than 75% complete assessments were not included in analyses.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress: Several steps were taken this year to improve assessment and data entry reliability:

- ELLN and RTC teams continued to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data
- recorded tutorials were maintained on the KEDS website to allow 24/7 viewing of data entry procedures
- the KEDS staff presented updates on the KEDS data entry process via a recorded webinar on the KDE website
- providers continued to be trained in data entry and reliability through face-to-face meetings, recorded tutorials, webinars, phone calls and emails
- FAQ documents were updated as needed to reflect changes in policy and in response to teacher and administrator questions
- the KEDS maintained district verification of all student demographic fields, to increase accuracy of data received
- additional steps were taken to review all data prior to inclusion in analyses, including a careful review of prior years' assessments to ensure complete assessments were included, as well as computer and staff verification of scoring rules for each assessment

Improvement activities: The KDE and partnering early childhood agencies (including, but not limited to, RTCs, KEDS and the Governor’s Office of Early Childhood) propose the following improvement activities targeted to improving the quality of programs and services to improve student outcomes. The strategies listed are existing in nature or to be implemented

beginning in the 2014 - 2015 preschool academic year (see note).

- The KDE will continue to conduct Preschool Program Reviews. Every district is included in a five-year Cohort cycle. During each cycle a KDE Preschool Consultant, along with members of their respective district's RTC, will evaluate the district based on evidence submitted within a timeline. Districts must submit proof of compliance with each state-funded preschool regulation. Evidence is submitted online. Consultants review items that include, but are not limited to, photos, teacher and assistant schedules, facility purchase orders, *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised* (ECERS-r) scores obtained by RTCs, program policies and procedures, intervention protocol, flyers and information from family-oriented activities and lesson plans.
- RTCs and the KDE will partner to provide ELLN trainings. Trainings will continue to assist with TA to districts across the state with compliance for assessment, data entry and increased reliability of data. Content will also cover regionally-specified needs based on RTC information.
- The KDE will review and revise policies and procedures related to the Kentucky System of Intervention/Response to Intervention (KSI/RtI) practices currently in place.
- The KDE will analyze KSI/RtI data from FFY 14 to disaggregate specific information on behavior interventions. This information will be used to inform early childhood partners on current trends and possible causes, and establish corrective action plans if needed.
- The Governor's Office of Early Childhood has created a webinar centered on families. This webinar ,entitled "Strengthening Families," is a free, three-hour web-based personal development resource designed to help all shareholders in early childhood meet the needs of young children.
- RTCs will continue to provide a diverse selection of trainings and resources that cover social and emotional domain growth.

These trainings include:

- Kentucky's Initiative in Social Emotional Development (KISSED): KISSED utilizes a team-based format to train early childhood educators and support staff in facilitating social/emotional development in young children. Participants gain both knowledge and skills necessary to the differing needs of young children. Three levels of need and corresponding intervention comprise the focus of the training. The team problem-solving approach builds local capacity to gain insight into children's behavior. It also provides expertise to promote children's increased social competence in school and at home. KISSED is organized into four training modules. This training is open to all early childhood providers. It is often attended by professionals serving Early Head Start, Head Start and child care locations.

- Second Step Curriculum: "Your youngest learners will benefit more from preschool and be better prepared for kindergarten with self-regulation and executive-function skills that help them pay attention, remember directions, and control their behavior." (http://www.cfchildren.org/second-step)

- Leader in Me: This is used in preschools to empower students to take ownership of their own data and learning progress. http://www.theleaderinme.org/

- Community Early Childhood Council (CECC) Trainings:

- Trainings offered on social-emotional development, milestones, adult-child interactions and Autism teams
- Summer conferences planned by the RTC with a strand of trainings that address behavior
- Nonviolent Seclusion and Restraint trainings—Safe Crisis Management
- RTC Lending Libraries that offer resources on social, emotional and behavior topics
- Preschool IEP Guidance Document with social/emotional present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLEP) examples The document offers ARC members guidance on the information that should be/could be included in an IEP. Examples of PLEPs and connecting goals are written in narrative form. The guidance document

was distributed at ELLN meetings in the fall.
- Observations in the classroom and as needed, case-specific technical assistance. This includes assistance in creating and implementing behavior intervention plans (BIPs) and behavior management strategies.

[Note:] State-funded preschool programs in Kentucky operate on a different academic calendar than K - 12 programs. Historically, preschool begins two weeks after the K - 12 program and ends two-weeks prior. This allows for service providers to conduct two mandatory home visits within the year; enter, disaggregate and disseminate data collected for a variety of benchmarking purposes; and ensure daily operations are within the state regulations.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Measurement: Overview of System:

In FFY 14, Kentucky completed the ninth year of the state-wide student progress measurement system for all students in the state-funded preschool program. This report summarizes assessment data collected in fall and winter of 2014 and spring of 2015 for all districts. Subsequent to a five-year phase-in of district assessments, this is the fourth year data have been collected and analyzed for all 173 districts across the state. (Note that Kentucky School for the Blind and Kentucky School for the Deaf are not included in the data collection.)

Approach: The Kentucky system for measuring progress on child outcomes is based on recommended practice for continuous assessment of all students aged birth to five years as defined by the *KY Early Childhood Standards* (KDE, 2002) and *KY Early Childhood Continuous Assessment Guide* (KDE, 2004). From a list of Kentucky-approved assessment instruments for monitoring student progress indicated below, five instruments were approved for primary use*. The remaining instruments were approved for use to complete assessments for students initially assessed with those tools.

- **Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Students, Second Edition (AEPS; Bricker et al., 2002);*
- *Brigance Early Inventory of Early Development II* (IED-II, 2010);
- **Carolina Curriculum for Preschoolers with Special Needs* (CCPSN; Johnson-Martin et al., 2004); and *Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs* (CCITSN, *Third Edition,* Johnson-Martin et al., 2004);
- *Learning Accomplishment Profile Third Edition* (LAP-3; Sanford et al., 2004); and *Early Learning Accomplishment Profile* (E-LAP; Glover et al., 1988);
- *Hawaii Early Learning Profile for Preschoolers: Assessment & Curriculum Guide* (HELP; VORT Corporation, 2006);
- **COR Advantage* (HighScope, 2013); *HighScope Preschool Child Observation Record* (Preschool COR; HighScope, 2003); and *HighScope Child Observation Record for Infants and Toddlers* (COR IT; HighScope, 2002);
- **Teaching Strategies GOLD*™(GOLD; Heroman, Burts, Berke, & Bickart, 2010); and,
- **Work Sampling System 5th Edition* (WSS; Dichtelmiller, Jablon, Marsden, & Meisels, 2013); and *Work Sampling for Head Start 5th Edition* (WSHS;Dichtelmiller, Jablon, Marsden, & Meisels, 2014).

Recommended assessment tools for the state were selected based on technical adequacy, inclusion of functional goals and multiple domains, utility for diverse populations, multiple modalities for collecting data, involvement of families, current use in the field and ease of administration (KDE, 2004). Local districts were instructed to assess students within six weeks of entering preschool and each successive spring and fall during which they were enrolled. If students enrolled after the initial data point, teachers were instructed to assess students within four weeks of their start date. All districts transitioned from Preschool and COR IT to COR Advantage during FFY 14/ FFY 15. However, some entry assessments for students in the current analyses were conducted in FFY 12. Therefore, the current results include some data from all versions of the assessment.

Training and Technical Assistance: Real-time video-conference training sessions were conducted to train preschool staff on approved methods for collecting and entering student data. The KDE conducted on-site meetings with preschool administrators and staff in spring 2015 for all school districts and reviewed KEDS procedures. KEDS staff conducted a video-recorded introduction to KEDS procedures, which was posted on the KDE website for all districts to use.

Frequent ongoing technical assistance (TA) has been provided by the KDE, Preschool Regional Training Centers (RTCs), Kentucky Early Learning Leadership (ELLN) and KEDS staff. TA to school districts included phone, email and web trainings in the appropriate use of assessment and screening tools, as well as publishers' data entry systems. Validity measures were discussed with preschool coordinators at regional meetings, and districts are implementing plans to measure the accuracy of assessment data at the local level. Guidance documents for the appropriate use of assessment measures and data collection were maintained, disseminated via training and posted on the KEDS website.

Data Collection: KEDS is housed at the University of Kentucky (UK) and provides a web-based platform for gathering data from multiple teachers and programs for progress monitoring on *KY Early Childhood Standards*, SPP Indicator 7 child outcomes and summary statements. Two types of data were collected. First, demographic data for each student were gathered from the KDE student information system (Infinite Campus) and imported into the data platform at KEDS. Each student record was verified by district personnel (e.g., preschool coordinator or classroom teacher) and additional demographic information were captured.

Second, item-level assessment data were collected from classroom teachers and therapists for all students served by each district, using online or paper/pencil formats according to publisher specifications. Data were either exported or entered into the KEDS system. Once all assessment data were received, they were matched to demographic data using the state-issued unique child identifier (SSID), and imported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Statistical Analysis System (SAS) for analysis.

Data Analyses: Data analyses for student progress were based on two levels of detailed crosswalks as conducted by instrument publishers and early childhood experts.

- The first level of instrument crosswalks included two detailed steps. First, specific items on each approved assessment instrument were aligned to the *KY Early Childhood Standards* and benchmarks by the publisher of each assessment tool. These alignments were reviewed, revised and approved by the KDE's early childhood staff. Second, each instrument crosswalk was reviewed in detail by an expert panel (including assessment and child development experts) to ensure coverage of the developmental continuum, alignment with Kentucky benchmarks and inclusion of examples describing each benchmark. This process included cross-assessment analyses.
- Once the review was completed, the expert panel age-anchored items for each benchmark. To determine consistent age anchors across tools, the panel utilized age-identified items for each instrument and, when not available, recommended behavioral sequences (Cohen and Gross, 1979). The panel also examined item similarity across assessments. All items were assigned to a six month age band for age-appropriate functioning. All instrument crosswalks were updated annually as instruments were revised by publishers.
- A second level crosswalk was then completed to align Kentucky's benchmarks and standards with the three SPP Indicator 7 child outcomes. The expert panel identified the benchmarks that best measured student progress according

to the three Indicator 7 child outcomes. Then, the second level crosswalk was developed to include, by instrument, specific assessment items that aligned with each benchmark, based on the developmental continuum for each benchmark and the definition of each outcome as provided by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center. These assessment-specific item sets were used for analyses of student progress on the Indicator 7 child outcomes and summary target statements.

Description of data set: Students enrolled in the state-funded preschool program (including all students receiving services under IDEA Part B, Section 619) for at least six months with at least two complete data points (i.e., assessed at least twice with an approved assessment) were included in analyses. Specific criteria for inclusion were: (a) students had been in the program a minimum of six months; (b) valid identifying student information (SSID and demographic information) was received; (c) assessment data were collected with one of the state-approved instruments via publisher-approved data collection methods (web-based or paper/pencil); and, (d) assessment data were at least 75% complete.

Methodology: To ensure data entry reliability, two data cleaning phases were implemented by KEDS staff. First, demographic fields collected within the KEDS system were reviewed to ensure all data were verified and matched with an SSID. Then, all assessments collected through KEDS and from publisher-approved methods were collected and merged with the cleaned demographic information. Duplicate assessments were removed, as were assessments where a valid SSID could not be found. Final item scores were re-coded to a dichotomous variable reflecting age-appropriate functioning. Each item was assigned a score of zero (*not age-appropriate functioning*) or one (*age-appropriate functioning*) based on the alignment work of the expert panel. The assigned item score was based on the student's age at the time of assessment.

The student's first and last assessments were utilized for Indicator 7 analyses. Based on the first level crosswalk procedure, all item scores were analyzed to determine age-appropriate functioning. Then, items that correlated with each Indicator 7 outcome were examined and the percentage of items on which the student scored at age level at exit for each outcome were calculated. Beginning in FFY13/ FFY14, the analysis algorithms were modified to more accurately measure change in child level of functioning, by focusing on the six-month age band corresponding to the child's age at exit in identifying age-appropriate functioning compared to same-age-peers.

In consultation with the KDE, age-appropriate functioning for categories c, d and e was set at 40%; i.e., a child had to have mastered 40% of the items within the six-month age band at time of assessment. Analyses examined items in all age bands covered by the assessments when determining absolute progress for categories a and b. Three percentages (one for each Indicator 7 outcome) were computed for each student on each assessment. Growth was determined by calculating the change in each percentage between the two assessments. Growth differences were categorized into five levels of functioning as specified by the Indicator: (a) students who did not improve, i.e., did not move nearer to age-equivalent functioning and exhibited no change or a decrease in item scores; (b) students who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to age-equivalent functioning, i.e., exhibited an item gain but did not exhibit an increase in age-equivalent functioning; (c) students who improved functioning and moved nearer to age-equivalent functioning but did not reach that of same-aged peers, i.e., achieved age-equivalent functioning on at least one item, but less than 40% of items used to measure an outcome; (d) students who improved functioning reaching levels comparable to same-aged peers, i.e., reached age-appropriate functioning on at least 40% of items used to measure an outcome; and, (e) students who maintained functioning comparable to same-aged peers, i.e., continued to function at age-level on 40% or more items for an outcome at both entry and exit from preschool.

Quality Assurance: Several procedures were implemented to ensure the accuracy and completeness of assessment data. Website data entry has limited options as defined by each of the assessment tools to reduce error. For example, AEPS scores of only zero, one, or two were allowed, and all items must have been scored. Data were cleaned as outlined above and analyzed by KEDS staff. Data entry procedures were reviewed with districts in the recorded video posted on the KDE website. Procedures to ensure quality monitoring of data accuracy and completeness were presented to district preschool coordinators during leadership meetings and ELLN trainings by the KDE staff and were reinforced in numerous website documents.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			28.50%	29.00%	29.50%	30.00%	30.50%	31.00%	31.50%	80.45%
Data			29.00%	23.00%	27.90%	34.00%	27.30%	31.10%	31.50%	80.45%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.55%	80.65%	80.75%	80.85%	80.95%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan and to advise the SAPEC on KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE uses a parent survey to obtain Indicator 8 data on the percentage of parents that report school districts facilatate parent involvement to improve services and results for their children who have disabilities and attend public school.

In FFY 14, the survey was expanded to include two new items.It was distributed to every parent of a child with an IEP in ev for Indicator 8. The KDE and the University of Kentucky Human Development Institute (HDI), a collaborative partner for Indicator 8, reviewed survey results in October 2015. The SAPEC approved changes to the FFY 14 survey and will be involved, if needed, in future changes.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3003.00	3528.00	80.45%	80.55%	85.12%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The KDE sent an email to all Directors of Special Education (DOSEs) within the state as part of the process to obtain data for Indicator 8. The email included a sample letter to parents explaining the purpose of the survey, as well as a link to an electronic survey. The email requested the DoSEs to forward the survey link and the letter to all district parents whose children had Individual Education Programs (IEPs). The information was distributed to school staff with students on their caseload who had IEPs. School staff then sent the information to parents.

The survey is intended for parents of both preschool and school-age students. While the results can be broken down between these two groups, they are not separate surveys and results are automatically combined.

Sample letters to be sent to parents by the districts were made available in Spanish and included a link to a Spanish version of the survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The survey targeted all parents of students with IEPs in Kentucky; therefore, distribution directly mirrored the state's demographics. The survey responses reflect the demographics of the state, with 81% of survey responses coming from parents of White students (compared to 85% overall state population), 7% from parents of Black students (8% statewide) and 3% Hispanic (3% statewide). Six percent (6%) of survey responses were from parents of children with multiple races, compared to 2% statewide. Figures come from U.S. Census estimates for 2014. No significant differences based on race were found in the percentage of parents responding "yes" to the question of whether the school involved them in a meaningful way as a means of improving services and results for their child.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes

- (●) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
- ( ) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

Submitted collection tool: 2015 Kentucky Parent Involvement Survey (English)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	3.44%	0%	1.14%	0%	0%	0.57%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
7	1	175	0%	0%	0.57%

Explanation of Slippage

The district did not review, analyze or document referal data in order to make appropriate eligibility determinations.

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has determined that *disproportionate representation* for Indicator 9 occurs when a specific racial and ethnic group's "risk" of being identified as a student in special education and related services (hereafter a student with an IEP) is two or more times higher than the risk of being identified as a student with an IEP for students in all other racial and ethnic groups.

The method used by the KDE to calculate disproportionate representation for a school district is the risk ratio method, as

set forth below.

Risk Ratio =

The racial and ethnic group's "risk" of being a student with an IEP **(Numerator)**

Divided by

The risk for students in all other racial and ethnic groups of being a student with an IEP **(Denominator)**

The numerator is obtained by dividing the number of district students in the racial and ethnic group who have IEPs, by the total number of district students in the specific racial and ethnic group in the district.

The data used in the numerator are from the KDE's Growth Factor Reports and Section 618 data respectively.

The denominator is calculated by dividing the number of district students who have IEPs that are not in the specific racial and ethnic group, by the total number of district students who are not in the specific racial and ethnic group.

Again, the data used to determine the denominator are found in the KDE's Growth Factor Reports and Section 618 data respectively.

In calculating the risk ratio for each Kentucky school district, the specific racial and ethnic group's risk of having an IEP (the numerator) is divided by the risk for all other students for having an IEP (the denominator). For example, if 20% of students in the specific racial and ethnic group have IEPs and 20% of all other district students have IEPs, the risk ratio is one (1). But if 40% of a specific racial and ethnic group have IEPs as compared to 20% of all other students in the district, the risk ratio is two.

In addition to a risk ratio of two or higher, the KDE has included two additional criteria for determining disproportionate representation:

- There must be 10 or more students in the specific racial and ethnic group that have IEPs; and,
- There must be 50 or more students in the specific racial and ethnic group in the district.

The additional criteria are used to ensure the risk ratio accurately identifies disproportionate representation within the district and is not the result of a small number of students within the racial and ethnic group.

Thus, the KDE will find a district has disproportionate representation of the specific racial and ethnic group in special education, if the district has:

1. A risk ratio of 2.0 or higher ($\geq$ 2.0);
2. 10 or more students with IEPs in the specific racial and ethnic group (n $\geq$ 10); and,
3. 50 or more students in the district in the specific racial and ethnic group (n $\geq$ 50).

Determining disproportionate representation by using the three factors listed above is the first part of the Indicator 9 process. The final step is determining whether the district's disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification of the district's racial and ethnic group members as special education students.

The KDE uses desk audits to decide if students in the specific racial and ethnic group have been inappropriately identified under IDEA. If a district has disproportionate representation due to a risk ratio of $\geq$ 2.0, the KDE randomly selects district students from the specific racial and ethnic group who have IEPs and requires the district to provide the KDE with the students' educational records.

The KDE then uses its Compliance Record Review Document to dectermine if the students have been appropriately identified under IDEA. If the KDE finds, through its review of records, that students were inappropriately identified under IDEA, the district will be cited by the KDE as having disproportionate representation of students with IEPs within the specific racial and ethnic group, due to inappropriate identification.

The KDE's Compliance Record Review Document may be found at:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/Monitoring-Documents.aspx

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districtidentified in FFY 2014 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, 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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 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 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data			14.94%	0%	4.55%	0%	3.41%	1.14%	0.57%	2.29%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
18	0	175	2.29%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has determined that *disproportionate representation* for Indicator 10 occurs when a racial and ethnic group's "risk" of being identified in a specific disability category is two or more times higher than the risk of being identified in the specific disability category for students in all other racial and ethnic groups.

The sources of the data are the KDE's Section 618 data and the Growth Factor Reports respectively.

In addition to a risk ratio of two or higher, the KDE has included two additional criteria for determining disproportionate representation:
There must be 10 or more students in the specific racial and ethnic group who are identified in the specific disability category.

There must be 50 or more students in the specific racial and ethnic group in the district.
The additional criteria are to ensure the risk ratio accurately identifies disproportionate representation within the district and is not the result of a small number of students within the racial and ethnic group.

To recap, the KDE will find a district has disproportionate representation for a racial and ethnic group that is identified in a particular disability category, if the district has:

1. A risk ratio of 2.0 or higher ($\geq$ 2.0); and
2. 10 or more students in the specific racial/ ethnic group who are identified in the particular disability category (n $\geq$10); and
3. 50 or more students in the district in the specific racial and ethnic group (n $\geq$50).

Determining disproportionate representation by using the three factors listed above is the first step of the Indicator 10 process. The final step is determining whether the district's disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification in the specific disability category.

The KDE uses desk audits to decide if students in the specific racial and ethnic group have been inappropriately identified in a disability category. If a district has disproportionate representation for Indicator 10 due to a risk ratio of $\geq$ 2.0, the KDE randomly selects district students from the specific racial and ethnic group who are identified in the particular disability category. After selecting students, the KDE requires the district to provide the KDE with the students' educational records.

The KDE then uses its Compliance Record Review Document to determine whether the students have been appropriately identified under the particular disability category. If the KDE finds, through its review of records, that students from the racial and ethnic group were inappropriately identified under the specific category of disability, the district will be cited by the KDE as having disproportionate representation of students under Indicator 10, due to inappropriate identification.

The KDE's Compliance Record Review Document may be found at:

http://education.ky.gov/specialed/excep/Pages/Monitoring-Documents.aspx

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Based on several years of trend data from districts that have been cited for disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification, the Division of Learning Services (DLS) has determined that the root cause for the

disproportionate representation is due to districts' failure to appropriately implement existing federal and state regulations.

The DLS requested a sampling of records for students from the district in the identified areas of disproportionate representation for the appropriate race/ethnicity group in question.

All student records were reviewed by the KDE team using the Compliance Record Review Document (2014-15 school year). The team specifically examined record review items 61 through 69B on IDEA eligiblity determination, as well as for the specific categorical area(s) in question.

Each submitted student file was reviewed with the following guiding question in mind: “Does the review of this file support that the district has disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification?” After reviewing the files provided by the district, the KDE Review Team holistically considered the status of the student records reviewed and looked for patterns of noncompliance within the record review areas examined in order to make the final determination whether the district is or is not in compliance with the requirements of Indicator 10.

It is possible that areas of noncompliance may be noted in one or more student files. Any areas of identified noncompliance at the individual student level must be corrected. Areas of systemic noncompliance must be corrected by the district as well. In order to accomplish the “two-pronged” approach required by *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*, the DLS will review each of these files for corrections. The DLS also reviews additional student files to verify the district has achieved compliance both systemically and at the student-specific level, prior to closing a corrective action plan.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

707 KAR 1:380 specifies that, after an off-site or on-site review, the KDE must issue a written report. Deficiencies (instances of noncompliance) specified in the report shall be the basis for the district to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for review and approval by the KDE. The district has the opportunity to submit additional information or to verify or clarify issues related to the report (prior to the development of the CAP). Each CAP must be monitored and enforced by the KDE.

The district must submit its CAP to the KDE no later than 30 business days after the district receives the report. Business day means Monday through Friday except for federal and state holidays as defined by 707 KAR 1:002 (6).

The CAP must include:
• A statement of the matter to be corrected
• The steps the LEA shall take to correct the problem and document compliance

The DLS will send a CAP template to the Director of Special Education (DoSE) for development of the district’s CAP.

Within 30 business days of receiving the CAP, the KDE must notify the district of the status of the CAP. If the KDE rejects the CAP, the district has up to 15 business days to submit a new CAP. A CAP, once approved by the KDE must be monitored and is an official document requiring the district to meet the specified activities.

The KDE will not initiate further sanctions during the time period specified in the CAP unless requested by the district. Any noncompliance found during monitoring must be corrected within one year. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) specifies the one-year timeline runs from the date the KDE notifies the district in writing of the noncompliance until the KDE notifies the district in writing that the noncompliance has been corrected.

Student Level and Systemic Noncompliance:

The KDE tracks findings of noncompliance and requires correction at the individual student level as required by OSEP. The KDE also looks for compliance at a systemic level. For the purposes of the KDE monitoring, “systemic” means findings of noncompliance where related issue(s) are occurring more than once.

In cases where systemic noncompliance is noted, the district must not only correct the individual student files as necessary, but must also determine the cause for the noncompliance and take steps in the CAP to correct these issues.

The district is required to submit CAP status reports on a quarterly basis to the DLS team leader. It is strongly recommended that the district submit copies of student-specific corrections as they occur in order for the team leader to review and provide timely feedback to the district.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.43%	94.48%	94.87%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.27%	99.54%	99.29%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2,914	2,898	99.29%	100%	99.45%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	16

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) collects State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) data for Indicator 11 by requiring districts to submit a report by June 15 each year to the KDE containing randomly selected, child-specific data for the indicator.

The KDE validates these data through random desk audits using its student information system and viewing actual student process records through desk audits or on-site visits. The student records reported by the districts are verified, along with additional student files for comparison purposes.

During the 2014 - 2015 school year, the KDE independently verified Indicator 11 data while conducting on-site monitoring visits for twelve districts that self- reported 100% compliance during the 2014 - 2015 school year. Of those districts receiving on-site visits, no district was cited for noncompliance under Kentucky's evaluation timeline of 60 school days.

The range of day in the state beyond the timeline was:

Least number of days = One

Greatest number of days = Seven

The most common reasons for the delays include the following:

- availability of evaluation personnel
- parental factors (excluding when parent repeatedly failed to produce the child for evaluation)
- excessive student absenteeism
- district personnel training issues
- difficulty in obtaining external evaluation components

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ○ **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**
- ◉ **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ◉ **State monitoring**
- ○ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The KDE collects SPP and APR data for Indicator 11 by requiring districts to submit a report to KDE on compliance with Indicator 11, based on the districts' review of randomly selected, child-specific data for the indicator. The districts' reports are due to the KDE by June 15 of each year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To determine correction of Indicator 11 noncompliance at a systemic level, the KDE took the following steps to verify there were no systemic violations:

The KDE reviewed additional randomly selected files for students who were initally evaluated subsequent to the district's implementation of its Corrective Action Plan (CAP) activities. Because the randomly chosen files were found to be in compliance, the KDE determined the district was in systemic compliance with Prong Two of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Based on its random record review, the KDE has reasonable confidence the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 13 corrected systemic noncompliance under *OSEP Memorandum 09-02.*

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The steps the KDE took to verify the correction of findings of individual noncompliance identified in FFY 13 are as follows:

- Based on a review of district-submitted data, the KDE notified districts of their noncompliance when the districts self-reported less than 100% compliance with Indicator 11. Districts were required to submit the student files to the KDE that were identified as exceeding the sixty school day timeline.
- During its review of student files, the KDE verified individual correction of noncompliance. For all student records exceeding the sixty school day timeline, the evaluation had been completed, eligibility determined and, if eligible, an Individual Education Program (IEP) was developed for the student, even if late. This is consistent with Prong One of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Based on record reviews, the KDE has reasonable confidence the districts identified with individual noncompliance in FFY 13 corrected the noncompliance according to *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		93.74%	96.56%	95.69%	98.73%	99.60%	99.65%	99.86%	99.82%	99.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,705
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	262
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,111
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	227
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	90

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	2,111	2,126	99.62%	100%	99.29%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	15

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

The range of days an IEP was developed beyond the third birthday was 8 to 57 days. Reasons for the delays were:

- Parent refusal to provide consent for evaluation for initial services

- District unable to locate child/family in timely manner
- Referral from Part C received late [less than 90 days prior to child's third birthday]
- Inclement weather
- Request for delay due to child's illness
- Unfilled staff positions during 60-school day eligibility timeline window

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- (●) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) collects data from districts using the end of year Preschool Program Performance Report (P2R). Districts report transition data to the KDE by June 30th of each year. School Readiness staff from the KDE review transition data for errors and noncompliance. When errors are noted, districts are required to revise and re-submit data. Staff from the KDE and Regional Training Centers (RTCs) work with districts to meet transition compliance in subsequent years.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The two districts that did not meet 100% compliance for FFY 13 reported 100% complicance on the FFY 2014 end of year Preschool Program Performance Report (P2R). To determine correction of Indicator 12 noncompliance at a systemic level, the KDE took the following steps to verify there were no systemic violations:

For each district, the KDE reviewed randomly selected files of students who were transitioned to preschool from Part C (First Steps) subsequent to the district's implementation of its Plan of Improvement. Because the randomly chosen files were found to be in compliance, the KDE determined the district was in systemic compliance with Prong Two of *OSEP*

Memorandum 09-02.

Based on its random record review, the KDE has reasonable confidence the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 13 corrected their systemic noncompliance pursuant to *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The districts with Indicator 12 noncompliance indicated various reasons for their inability to transition Part C students and have an IEP in place by the students' third birthdays. A KDE School Readiness consultant contacted each district and extrapolated specific reasons in each case. Details were documented and solutions were reached regarding reasons for delays. All issues were resolved and IEP services were put into place for individual students within a reasonable timeline. The districts submitted a Plan for Improvement that outlined steps they will take to ensure compliance in the future.

The KDE also verifed that, for students transitioning from Part C for whom an IEP was not in place by the third birthday, there was documentation showing an IEP was developed and implemented although late, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction. This is consistent with Prong 1, *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Based on the correction of individual student noncompliance and the random record review verifying systemic compliance discussed above, the KDE believes with reasonable confidence that both districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 13 have corrected the noncompliance, according to both prongs specified in *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						92.95%	94.61%	98.37%	97.07%	98.98%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2,215	2,233	98.98%	100%	99.19%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- (●) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) collects State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) data for Indicator 13 by requiring districts to submit a report to the KDE containing randomly selected, child-specific data for Indicator 13. The reports are due to the KDE by June 15 of each year

The KDE validates the data by random desk audits using its student information system and viewing actual student due process records during onsite visits. The actual student records reported by the districts are verified, along with additional student files for comparison purposes.

During the 2014 - 2015 school year ,the KDE independently verified Indicator 13 data while conducting onsite monitoring

visits for fourteen districts that self-reported 100% compliance with Indictor 13. Of those districts, three districts were cited for Indicator 13 noncompliance.

The data above represents districts in Kentucky that have the required prerequisites to report on secondary transition in their district for Indicator 13. All districts are not required to report because of the "n" size of ten.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	13	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 13, the KDE cited 13 districts for non-compliance with Indicator 13. During FFY 2014, KDE verified the districts had corrected systemic noncompliance. The randomly selected student folders reviewed, either through desk audits or on-site monitoring visits, verified the folders were in compliance with Indicator 13.

This satifies Prong Two of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

All findings of non-compliance were verified through the KDE's review of individual student records and random folders, in accordance with both prongs of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

School districts are required to correct all individual findings of Indicator 13 noncompliance. DLS, in accordance with Prong One of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*, verifies individual student corrrection of noncompliance through the following process:

Prong 1: As part of the individual student review process for all students identified with Indicator 13 non-compliance, DLS reviews individual student folders that were out of compliance with Indicator 13 during the previous year. During desk audits or on-site visits, DLS examines each student's record and verifies through use of the KDE Compliance Record Review Document that the Indicator 13 non-compliance for each student has been corrected.

As noted above, Prong 2 (systemic compliance) is satisfied by the DLS conducting random record reviews of Indicator 13 from the district's student folders.

Based on record reviews of student-level and randomly selected folders, the KDE has reasonable confidence that the 13 districts previously identified with Indicator 13 violations corrected their non-compliance according to both prongs of *OSEP Memorandum 09-02*.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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 competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							24.50%	25.00%	25.50%	25.50%
		Data						23.90%	23.20%	19.70%	19.80%	18.75%
B	2009	Target ≥							52.70%	53.70%	54.70%	55.00%
		Data						51.70%	52.10%	57.10%	55.70%	59.49%
C	2009	Target ≥							62.40%	63.90%	65.40%	65.70%
		Data						60.90%	64.90%	68.00%	65.80%	67.59%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	25.50%	25.50%	25.50%	25.50%	25.50%
Target B ≥	55.20%	55.40%	55.60%	55.80%	56.00%
Target C ≥	65.90%	66.10%	66.30%	66.50%	66.70%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and to advise the SAPEC on KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original SPP. Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13- FFY 18.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2632.00

1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	485.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1046.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	111.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	143.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	485.00	2632.00	18.75%	25.50%	18.43%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1531.00	2632.00	59.49%	55.20%	58.17%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1785.00	2632.00	67.59%	65.90%	67.82%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			70.00%	73.00%	75.00%	78.00%	80.00%	70.00%	70.00%	
Data		68.00%	80.00%	43.00%	50.00%	29.00%	78.00%	25.00%	0%	33.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%	70.00%	-	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original SPP. Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13- FFY 18.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	6	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1	6	33.33%	70.00% - 80.00%	16.67%

Explanation of Slippage

There is no slippage.

Kentucky was not required to report its Indicator 15 data for either FFY 14 or FFY 13 since the number of resolution sessions held in both years did not meet the minumum 'n' size of ten. During both FFY 13 and 14, Kentucky convened only six resolution sessions each year.

Kentucky's Indicator 15 data for both FFY 13 and FFY 14 were reported in error in the tables above. There cannot be slippage since the data should not have been reported.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2014. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

.

Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			61.00%	68.00%	75.00%	81.00%	85.00%	61.00%	61.00%	
Data		66.00%	75.00%	90.00%	68.00%	82.35%	78.26%	60.00%	70.59%	75.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	61.00%	-	85.00%	61.00%	-	85.00%	61.00%	-	85.00%	61.00%	-	85.00%	61.00%	-	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has a relationship with the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC) that is collaborative and strives to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The KDE continues to consult the SAPEC for input when determining outcome-based targets for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and to advise the SAPEC on the KDE's progress toward meeting its targets.

The KDE consulted with the SAPEC three times in setting new targets for FFY 13 through FFY 18. A description of each indicator was provided to the SAPEC with information regarding data and trajectories from the original SPP. Feedback was provided and used to assist in determining targets for FFY 13 - FFY 18.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	14	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
7	5	14	75.00%	61.00% - 85.00%	85.71%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The status listed above for Indicator 16 is incorrect. Kentucky met its target for FFY 14.

Kentucky's Indicator 16 target is expressed as a range of percentages, in that 61% to 85% of mediations held in Kentucky are to result in mediation agreements.

85.71% of mediations held in Kentucky during FFY 14 resulted in mediation agreements. Kentucky met and exceeded its outer range target of 85%.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		22.20%
Data	14.00%	12.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	30.90%	39.50%	48.20%	56.80%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The KDE continues to strive to improve its overall accountability system. In making those improvements, KDE set new proficiency targets in the spring of 2015, based on projections for Kentucky's statewide assessment results.

The goals of the SiMR are focused on math proficiency of 8th grade SWD who take the regular statewide assessment with or without accommodations. The change in KDE's overall targets necessitated a revision of KDE's SiMR targets. The change was necessary to keep the SSIP aligned with the KDE broader accountability model.

Kentucky did not meet its target for FFY 2014.

KDE will begin implementing its SiMR activities next year during Phase III. It expects to see an increase in math proficiency in the targeted SSIP population within 2-3 years.

Description of Measure

Aligned to Indicator 3C (Proficiency for students with IEPs), Grade 8:

Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of 8th Grade students with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachment.

Overview

Please see attachment

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please see attachment.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see attachment.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Please see attachment.

Description

Please see attachment.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified

result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see attachments.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please see attachment.

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attachment

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attachment

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attachment

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attachment

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Gretta Hylton

Title: Director of Division of Learning Services

Email: gretta.hylton@education.ky.gov

Phone: 502-564-4970