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Introduction: Crystal Bishop was the presenter for Day Two of the KITS 2014 Summer Institute. Crystal is a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Florida Center for Excellence in Early Childhood Studies. She has been working in the fields of early intervention and early childhood special education for ten years. She has taught in center-based inclusive preschool settings and provided coaching and training to parents and teachers in private, center-based preschool, public preschool, and Head Start settings.

Crystal's research interests include the impacts of professional development on teachers' implementation of evidence-based practices and the translation of early childhood policy into practice. Crystal has worked on a federally funded research project to help develop professional development materials to enhance preschool teachers' implementation of embedded-instruction practices, including the Tools for Teachers: Embedded Instruction for Early Learning Toolkit and the Embedded Instruction Observation System-Teacher Version. Currently, Crystal is working on a federally funded project designed to examine the impact of coaching on preschool teachers' implementation of Pyramid Model practices. She also works with the National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning to develop materials and provide technical assistance to Head Start programs implementing Practice-Based Coaching.

Author's Note: The following article is an excerpt from a manuscript in the process of publication: High Quality Instruction Through Complete Learning Trials: Blending Intentional Teaching with Embedded Instruction by Erin E. Barton, Vanderbilt University, and Crystal Crowe Bishop and Patricia Snyder, University of Florida. Please do not cite.

Embedded instruction is a systematic approach to providing instruction during contextually relevant, ongoing activities and routines to support child engagement and learning (Snyder, Hemmeter, McLean, Sandall, & McLaughlin, 2013). This means teachers plan for and
embed a sufficient number of instructional trials across the day for those children who need additional instructional support. Four considerations are relevant for implementing embedded instruction: (a) what to teach, (b) when to teach, (c) how to teach, and (d) how to evaluate (Snyder et al., 2013; Wolery, n. d.).

What to teach refers to the content of instruction. This involves the development of instructional learning targets that are (a) aligned with the general preschool curriculum; (b) functional, which means they are related to skills children will need to participate in naturally occurring daily activities and routines; (c) generative, which refers to skills that can be used across settings, materials, and people; and (d) measurable, which means the learning target is defined in such a way that the teacher can monitor the child’s progress and make data-based decisions about instruction. When to teach refers to the processes teachers use to identify relevant instructional contexts in which they can embed learning opportunities targeting a child’s or group of children’s individualized learning targets. How to teach refers to the processes teachers use to identify instructional procedures that align with the learning target skill, the child’s phase of learning (i.e., acquisition, fluency, maintenance, generalization), and the child’s learning history. How to evaluate refers to the processes by which teachers collect data to determine whether they are implementing embedded instruction practices as planned, whether the child is making progress toward the learning target skill, and whether changes to the implementation of embedded instruction practices are needed.

Embedded instruction is a recommended practice in early intervention/early childhood special education (Wolery, 2005). It has been demonstrated to be effective for teaching a variety of skills in early childhood settings. For example, embedded instruction has been used to teach social skills (Venn, Wolery, Werts, Morris, DeCesare, & Cuffis, 1993), academic skills (Daugherty, Grisham-Brown, & Hemmeter, 2001; Horn, Lieber, Li, Sandall, & Schwartz, 2000), and language skills (Grisham-Brown, Shuster, Hemmeter, & Collins, 2000) to young children in preschool classrooms. Quality instruction includes both setting the occasion for children’s learning (i.e., providing learning opportunities) and ensuring sufficient opportunities to respond (i.e., learning trials). The purpose of this article is to describe complete learning trials (CLTs) as the foundation for embedded instruction and to provide guidance for practitioners to plan for, implement, and evaluate CLTs during contextually relevant activities, routines, and transitions.

CLTs

The term Complete Learning Trial (CLT) is used for a three-term contingency that includes a naturally occurring or planned antecedent (A) that occasions a child behavior (B) and is followed by naturally occurring or planned feedback or consequence (C). An intentional teacher organizes the learning environment so the three-term contingency will emerge. In addition, the intentional teacher will use systematic instructional procedures to deliver antecedents that will set the occasion for targeted child behaviors and to deliver consequences or feedback following the child behavior.

Planning for CLTs: Considering Antecedents and Consequences

CLTs are effective when teachers intentionally plan the antecedent and consequence in relation to an individual child’s or group of children’s learning targets, learning phase, and the instructional context. In embedded instruction, teachers intentionally and systematically implement sufficient numbers of CLTs focused on identified learning targets. The teacher systematically and intentionally designs the environment and plans what, how, and when to embed CLTs to ensure each child receives multiple, meaningful instructional opportunities.

It is important to create a written plan detailing the implementation of CLTs for each child or group of children. This might include a list of the daily routines and activities and specific plans for which instructional procedures to use and how many CLTs to embed on which learning target behavior within each activity across the day. The written forms should allow the teacher to plan and monitor implementation. Once the plans are created, it is important to review the opportunities for CLTs and ensure they are sufficient to promote child learning.

Implementing CLTs

CLTs can be implemented for an individual child or groups of children during planned and naturally occurring activities. This ensures that children receive the appropriate amount of instruction on learning targets. Implementation can begin once the learning targets for groups and individual children are identified and instruction is planned. The planning should guide the when, how, and the number of CLTs to embed.
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Delivery of CLTs

CLTs can be massed, spaced, or distributed within meaningful contexts based on the needs of the child, the learning target, and the context. Massed trials are delivered as consecutive, discrete CLTs within an activity or routine. Spaced trials are also delivered within an activity or routine, however, there is a non-instructional pause in between trials. Distributed trials are embedded within or across routines and activities. Massed, spaced, or distributed trials are delivered based on the context (i.e., the expectations within activity), the child’s learning targets, and the phase of learning. A child might need more massed trials if they are just learning a skill related to a learning target behavior and more distributed trials if they are generalizing a skill.

Evaluation of CLTs

An important component of embedded instruction is evaluating the implementation of CLTs. Evaluating CLTs involves collecting data to determine whether teachers are implementing CLTs as intended and if a child or group of children is learning skills related to their learning targets. Although practitioners often think about collecting data to monitor child progress, it is equally important to examine whether the learning trials are implemented as planned.

Collecting data on implementation.

There are a number of ways teachers can collect and use data on their implementation of CLTs. They can count the number of learning trials delivered for a learning target and compare it to the instructional plan. This might be useful in conjunction with child data to determine whether the number of trials is sufficient. This information also helps the teacher evaluate whether the instructional plan is being implemented as planned. It does not, however, give any information about whether the learning trials delivered were CLTs. A teacher might also videotape herself implementing learning trials and then review the video to determine whether the learning trials were complete and which instructional procedures were used (Bishop, Snyder, & Crow, 2014; Crowe, Snyder, Crow, & Mullin, 2011). This method for collecting data provides information on both the implementation of CLTs and child behaviors and will help the teacher make decisions about whether she needs to be more intentional in planning or implementing the components of a CLT or whether she might want to try a different instructional procedure.

Collecting child data.

In addition to collecting data on implementation of CLTs, it is important to collect data to monitor children’s progress toward their learning targets. There are several types of data that can be collected to monitor child progress, including the frequency with which the child demonstrates the target behavior within and across activities, the amount of time it takes a child to complete a task, the percentage of opportunities in which the child demonstrates the target behavior, what level of support is needed, or how fluent the child is in demonstrating the behavior. The type of data to collect and when to collect it depends on the child’s learning target, the instructional plan, and whether the goal is to assess acquisition, fluency, generalization, or maintenance. Child data should be used in conjunction with implementation data to determine whether changes are needed to the number of CLTs implemented, whether additional support is needed or prompting can be faded, and whether the child might be ready for a new target skill.

Important Considerations

When planning to embed CLTs, there are several important considerations. First, it is important to understand each child’s present level of development and learning history. This will help with identifying functional, developmentally appropriate learning targets and effective instructional procedures. Second, ensure you are providing a sufficient number of embedded learning trials for each child. This involves careful planning of all aspects of the environment and ongoing progress monitoring. CLTs should be continually adapted to ensure children are maintaining skills and generalizing them across settings, activities, routines, materials, and people. Third, part of planning should involve determining how to deliver the trials. CLTs can be massed, spaced, or distributed within meaningful contexts based on the needs of the child, the learning target, and the context. Finally, remember the ultimate outcomes from blended instruction focus on preschool children (a) acquiring and using knowledge and skills, including communication and early literacy; (b) having positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships; and (c) using appropriate behavior to meet their needs (Early Childhood Outcomes Center, 2005). As learning targets are identified, consider how the learning target behavior is related to one of these three ultimate outcomes.
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SAVE THE DATES!
KITS 2015
SUMMER INSTITUTE
JUNE 2 – 5, 2015
AT THE
EUGENE M. HUGHES METROPOLITAN COMPLEX AT WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY, WICHITA, KANSAS

Items of Note for Your Calendar

July
16 Disability (ADA) Awareness Day

August
✓ Children’s Eye Health and Safety Month
✓ Children’s Vision and Learning Month
✓ Get Ready for Kindergarten Month
✓ Immunization Awareness Month

September
8 International Literacy Day
15 School Backpack Awareness Day
✓ Baby Safety Awareness Month
✓ Newborn Screening Awareness Month

October
5 World Teachers’ Day
5-11 Mental Illness Awareness Week
✓ Down Syndrome Awareness Month
✓ Physical Therapy Month
## Collaborative Calendar of Events

Training events for Kansas early childhood professionals

[www.kskits.org/training](http://www.kskits.org/training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT / LOCATION</th>
<th>SPONSOR / CONTACT / REGISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7/21   | Baby Doll Circle Time with Shana Schmidt / Newton                                 | KAIMH - (785) 218-8236 or stephany@kaimh.org  
Register online at:  
http://events.r20.constantcontact.com/register/event?oeidk=a07e99qi2bre83af1bb&lrl=ce7m85dab |
| 7/22   | Deaf Education: Best Practices by Best Teachers / Wichita                         | Kansas State School for the Deaf - (913) 324-0600  
Register by contacting TOD@kssdb.org                                                                                                                            |
| 8/2    | KCCTO Super Saturday / Manhattan                                                   | Kansas Child Care Training Opportunities, Inc.  
(800) 227-3578 or (785) 532-7197  
| 8/11-12| Pathways to Our Future Early Childhood Education Conference / Mayetta             | Prairie Band Potawatomi Early Childhood Education Center –  
(785) 966-2707 or Nataliem@pbpnation.org                                                                                                                        |
| 8/28   | Prevent-Teach-Reinforce for Young Children (PTR-YC) Part I: Essential Prevention Practices for Reducing Challenging Behaviors in Early Care and Education Settings / Webinar | TASN-KITS – Register online at  
Session One: Thursday, August 28, 3:30-4:30 pm  
[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TLFK5JC](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TLFK5JC)  
Session Two: Friday, August 29, 11:30 am-12:30 pm  
[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/T2TL7HB](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/T2TL7HB)                                      |
| 9/6    | KCCTO Super Saturday / Hays                                                       | Kansas Child Care Training Opportunities, Inc.  
(800) 227-3578 or (785) 532-7197  
| 9/18   | Big Ideas of Early Mathematics: What Teachers of Young Children Need to Know / Online Book Study | TASN-KITS – Information available at  
| 10/7-9 | 2014 DEC International Conference on Young Children with Special Needs and Their Families / St Louis | Division for Early Childhood (DEC) – Information at  
| 10/15-17| Governor’s Conference for the Prevention of Child Abuse & Neglect / Wichita        | Kansas Childrens Service League – (316) 942-4261  
Online registration will open on 8/13/14 at [https://www.kcsl.org](https://www.kcsl.org)                                                                 |

Information on upcoming trainings are also listed on the KSDE TASN website at [http://www.ksdetasn.org](http://www.ksdetasn.org)
2013-14 Best Practice Award to ITSJC for Partnering with Community Child Care Programs for Child Find and Screening Services

Infant Toddler Services of Johnson County (ITSJC) has developed and fostered an extensive program of reaching out to the childcare community to enhance and expand our screening services. One of our staff has focused job responsibilities to guide these services, interact with childcare providers, and conduct screening in community settings. This program also utilizes online support for management of the screening information.

The ITSJC screening and child find process was established during the time that we were involved with the Kansas Early Learning Collaborative (KELC). In 2009, an ITSJC-sponsored hearing-screening program was implemented. KELC money was used to purchase equipment to complete the screenings. ITSJC now covers the cost of the contract audiologist. The hearing screenings are completed on a monthly basis with about a dozen children screened each month.

Beginning in 2010, KELC funds were used to contract with an early childhood special educator (ECSE) to perform ASQ-3 and ASQ-SE screenings at childcare centers and parents’ day out programs. In 2012, the online ASQ-Pro was purchased and families could complete the screening online. The ECSE followed up with each family that completed the screening online to discuss results and determine if a referral to ITSJC was warranted.

In 2009, before the child find team was implemented, there were 970 referrals made to ITSJC. In 2012, 1,231 referrals were made to ITSJC. This was a 22% increase. It was also our goal to increase public awareness of ITSJC. To that end, our ECSE distributed over 2,000 ITSJC materials and brochures to new contacts within the county in 2011 and 2012.

We are grateful that KELC was there to support our efforts as we launched this program and we are excited to continue on with the work of child find and screening.

Submitted by Amy Owens, Executive Director, Infant Toddler Services of Johnson County, (913) 432-2900, Ext. 104, amy.owens@itsjc.org

Let’s Look at Literacy

Read It Again Pre-K!

Are you looking for a scientifically based preschool curriculum supplement to promote language and literacy? Read It Again-Pre-K! may be just what you need. This FREE resource was developed by researchers Laura Justice and Anita McGinty, as an easy to use, flexible approach to building children’s language and literacy skills in four key areas: vocabulary, narrative, phonological awareness and print knowledge. Developed collaboratively with early childhood educators, state level policymakers, and speech-language pathologists, Read It Again-Pre-K! is well aligned with Kansas language and literacy early learning standards.

Read It Again-Pre-K! provides lesson plans for 30 weeks of systematic instruction, using commercially available storybooks as the context for building children’s language and literacy skills. Each week features two lessons (approximately 20-30 minutes) that can be implemented using whole-class, small-group, or even one-on-one instruction. Each lesson includes two activities designed to address specific language (narrative or vocabulary) and literacy (print knowledge or phonological awareness) learning objectives. The Read It Again-Pre-K! lessons also provide ideas for differentiated instruction and can be modified to meet the needs of children with a variety of language and literacy skills. A progress monitoring tool specific to the Read It Again-Pre-K! program is also included and provides a method to chart children’s progress on each of the learning objectives. Read It Again-Pre-K! can be easily integrated into virtually any classroom or curriculum.

To access this FREE resource, early childhood educators and allied professionals can download the entire Read It Again-Pre-K! from www.myreaditagain.com This download includes introductory content, lesson plans, implementation notes and a pupil progress monitoring checklist. To download the Read It Again-Pre-K! materials, click the register tab in the upper right corner of the home screen and create a free account. You will then have access to all the Read It Again-Pre-K! materials and supplements. Read It Again-Pre-K! is based on the latest scientific knowledge regarding how adults can support children’s language and literacy development using systematic and explicit instruction presented in highly meaningful literacy events, such as storybook reading (Justice & Ezell, 2000, 2002). Check out this FREE resource today!


Submitted by Chelie Nelson, Ph.D.
Early Childhood Technical Assistance Specialist
TASN-KITS
(316) 559-4626
chelie.nelson@ku.edu

KITS Newsletter
www.myreaditagain.com
www.kits.org
KITS 2014 Summer Institute: The Teaching Toolbox: Matching Strategies to Individual and Group Needs

KITS Summer Institute (SI) is a bit like summer camp for those of us who work with young children. This year we went to Manhattan to learn (and play) with friends from all over the state. The days were filled with opportunities to build new collegial friendships, participate in group learning activities and explore new territories (aka: areas of evidence-based practice). Our “camp counselors” came prepared to help us take out our microscopes and dissect our teaching practices so we could leave with new perspectives, skills and knowledge.

Day 1: Bonnie Keilty, Ed.D., from City College of New York, provided an overview on the process of creating successful and meaningful learning plans for all children. She posed important questions to the group including: what should we teach, what learning should we be promoting, and how should we teach and support this learning? Discussion and activities emphasized authentic assessment as the vehicle to know what we should be teaching each child and group of children that we work with, embedding teaching opportunities in all learning environments, and making modifications and adaptations for individual children, groups of children, and families. Bonnie shared the newly revised DEC Recommended Practices, emphasizing the guidance they provide our practice as intentional and reflective interventionists in the field of early childhood education.

Day 2: On the second day of SI, we dug into embedded instruction, which is defined as “a system-atic approach to providing individualized instruction during ongoing classroom activities, routines, and transitions to support children’s engagement and learning.” Crystal Bishop, Ph.D., from the University of Florida’s Center for Excellence in Early Childhood Studies, spent the day helping us identify, analyze and apply the four key components of embedded instruction: what to teach, when to teach, how to teach and how to evaluate our instruction. Using a case study and videotaped examples, participants developed priority learning targets (what to teach), developed classroom and home activity matrices (when to teach), discussed implementation of complete learning trials [Antecedent-Behavior-Consequence] (how to teach), and how we would evaluate our planned instruction (how to evaluate). Numerous tools and resources were added to our teaching toolboxes, thanks to Crystal’s thorough presentation.

Day 3: Tweety Yates, Ph.D., from the University of Illinois, took us on an adventure for the third day of SI. She asked us to put on some fancy new sunglasses so we could look at classroom, home and community learning environments through a different, more intentional lens. Tweety invited us to reflect on the learning environments we work in and look at them with fresh eyes to determine if they support embedded instruction and help children (and adults for that matter) know what is expected. She shared many strategies, ideas and resources on being more intentional and explicit about embedding teaching reminders throughout our daily environments as well as ways to embed social emotional, literacy and math instruction visually within routines and activities. The take-home message on Day Three of SI, be intentional when setting up environments for young children, will enable us to better facilitate optimal learning opportunities.

Day 4: On the last day of SI, Karen Nemeth, Ed.M., of Language Castle, LLC, had the participants think about the application of intentional teaching, embedded instruction and environmental arrangement in relation to the children in our programs who are dual language learners (DLL). Karen had us read and discuss the DEC Position Statement, “Responsiveness to ALL Children, Families, and Professionals: Integrating Cultural and Linguistic Diversity into Policy and Practice” with emphasis on the need to incorporate these recommendations, especially in relation to assessment and interventions, at the classroom and program levels. She reported that Kansas is one of the top ten states with an increasing DLL population. This reinforces how important it is for early intervention staff to support these children and their families. Karen shared numerous articles, books and resources to jumpstart us on this quest.

This year’s KITS Summer Institute offered the attendees an opportunity to dig into and analyze intentionality in our teaching practices. SI offered opportunities to share and learn from others, to reflect on current practices in our state and local programs, and to set some professional goals in relation to intentional teaching, intentional environments, and embedded instruction with ALL children and families we work with. We definitely came away with new ideas and resources for our teaching toolbox, just like the treasures we brought home from summer camp so many years ago.

Submitted by:
Nancy Miller, M.Ed., OTR/L
Early Childhood Student Services Consultant
Blue Valley School District
nmiller@bluevalleky12.org
The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) and the IDEA Dispute Resolution Parent Guides

The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) works to increase the nation's capacity to effectively resolve special education disputes, reducing the use of expensive adversarial processes. CADRE works with state and local education and early intervention systems, parent centers, families and educators to improve programs and results for children with disabilities. CADRE is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs at the US Department of Education to serve as the National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education.

Following OSEP's release of a Q&A on IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution in July 2013, CADRE was asked to create a set of companion resources for parents and families. In response, CADRE developed these four parent guides with the support of parent leaders from across the country:

IDEA Special Education Written State Complaints (Click here for Spanish)

IDEA Special Education Mediation (Click here for Spanish)

IDEA Special Education Due Process Complaints/Hearing Requests (Click here for Spanish)

IDEA Special Education Resolution Meetings (Click here for Spanish)

This information was taken from CADRE: http://www.directionservice.org/cadre/DRparentguides 2014.cfm

Part B ECSE Preschool Coordinator’s Corner

I hope this newsletter finds you doing well and enjoying your summer!

Part C to Part B Electronic Referral (CBER)

The pilot for the Part C to Part B Electronic Referral (CBER) ended on June 16, 2014. We will compile the data/feedback from our pilot sites and incorporate it into changes within the web system, CBER video and users guide. Statewide implementation began July 1, 2014. All programs should have received log-ins and passwords for CBER in March. If you have any questions please contact me.

CBER should not change any of your current practices as related to your Part C to Part B process. The Part C program in your community will continue to call or e-mail information regarding the toddlers who will be transitioning into your program.

IDEA State Performance Plan Reports

The finalized FFY 2012 (SY 2012-13) state-level and district-level IDEA State Performance Plan reports are available on the Kansas APR website. While preschool data is included on several of the indicators, we are primarily talking to districts about least restrictive environments in early childhood, transition from Part C to Part B and the early childhood rating system (OWS). All of these topics are linked to specific indicators.

Family Engagement and Partnership

We are excited about the work to begin on Family Engagement and Partnership across Kansas. Thanks to the Kellogg Foundation, Family and Schools Together, Inc., through partnership with TASN-KITS, received a grant to make this work a priority across Kansas early childhood. The statewide early childhood leadership team has begun meeting with Barbara Gannaway, the Project Coordinator, for initial discussion about the specifics of this work. Stay tuned for more news about this grant.

Submitted by Vera Lynne Stroup-Rentier
Education Program Consultant, 619 Coordinator
Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services
Kansas State Department of Education
785-296-5081
vstroup-rentier@ksde.org
Part C Coordinator’s Corner

There is a saying, “What’s in a word?” As I was thinking of what to write for this edition of the KITS Newsletter I kept thinking about this saying and all of the things we have going on at KDHE. Another thought or saying occurred to me, a play on those very words I was wondering about. These thoughts lead me to the Wordle website and another question, a play on those very “words”. What is in a “Wordle”? The obvious answer is words of course. The result of my visit to the Wordle website resulted in the illustration you see here. These words represent all of the things that are happening at KDHE right now.

Perhaps the most daunting task we have going on right now is tackling Results Driven Accountability (RDA). The Office of Special Education Programs is moving to RDA as its focus for monitoring states and their implementation of Parts C and B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The purpose of RDA is to create a balance between the focus on improved results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities and their families while considering compliance as it relates to those results and outcomes.

"For too long we’ve been a compliance-driven bureaucracy when it comes to educating students with disabilities."
- Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education

OSEP has Identified Seven Core Principles of RDA

1. A system that is developed in partnership with our stakeholders.
2. A system that is transparent and understandable to states and the general public, especially individuals with disabilities and their families.
3. A system that drives improved outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities regardless of their age, disability, race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, or location.
4. A system that ensures the protection of the individual rights of each child or youth with a disability and their families, regardless of his/her age, disability, race/ethnicity, language, gender, socioeconomic status, or location.
5. A system that provides differentiated incentives, supports, and interventions based on each state’s unique strengths, progress, challenges, and needs.
6. A system that encourages States to direct their resources to where they can have the greatest positive impact on outcomes and the protection of individual rights for all children and youth with disabilities, and minimizes State burden and duplication of effort.
7. A system that is responsive to the needs and expectations of the ultimate consumers (i.e., children and youth with disabilities and their families) as they identify them.

As part of the move to RDA, we are gearing up to develop a new State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR). We have been and will continue to seek input from stakeholders about what should go into the new SPP/APR throughout the process. A large portion of the process involved developing a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), which will take place in three phases. In this article, I seek to provide you with a broad overview of what this process entails.

Developing and Implementing the SSIP

States will develop and implement their individual SSIPs for Parts B and C in three phases. Each phase needs to involve significant stakeholder input—and states must describe in their SSIPs how they involve stakeholders in developing, implementing, and evaluating the SSIPs. Here’s a brief description of what else is involved in each phase.

Part C Coordinator’s … continues on Page 10
Phase 1: Analysis
(Components to be submitted by 2015)

Phase I must include the following:

- **Data Analysis:** The SSIP must describe how the State identified and analyzed key data in order to (1) select the area or result to be improved for children with disabilities (called the State-identified Measurable Result for Children with Disabilities), and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. Key data to be analyzed include data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data (as applicable). This must be done for both Parts B and C.

- **State-identified Measurable Result for Children with Disabilities:** What result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities does the State intend to improve in its Part C systems? What result(s) for students with disabilities will be improved under Part B? This information about the “State-identified measurable result for children with disabilities” must be stated in the SSIP the State submits to OSEP in Phase 1.

- **Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity:** States will need a strong infrastructure to build the capacity of LEAs and EIS programs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices that improve results for children with disabilities. To that end, States must analyze their infrastructure to determine if improvements are needed in systems of governance, fiscal oversight, quality standards, professional development, data capacity, technical assistance, and accountability.

The SSIPs that each State submits to OSEP in Phase 1 must include a description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its infrastructure and the conclusions it drew regarding needed improvements.

- **Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies:** What improvement strategies will the State use to achieve the desired result(s) for children with disabilities served under Part C or Part B? The SSIP must explain how the improvement strategies were selected; why they are sound, logical, and aligned; and how they will lead to measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers in Part C and for students with disabilities under Part B.

- **Theory of Action:** The SSIP must include a graphic illustration of the State’s “theory of action” for the improvement strategies it has selected. In other words, it must explain in its SSIP why doing X (improvement strategies) will improve Y (the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs and EIS programs and achieve improvement in the State-identified result for children with disabilities).

Phase 2
(Components to be submitted in 2016)

In Phase 2, each State outlines the details of the coherent improvement strategies identified in Phase 1 and makes each of its SSIPs (one for Part C and one for Part B) into actionable plans based on the State’s theory of action.

- **How will the State improve infrastructure?** Based on the data analysis of infrastructure conducted in Phase 1, the State can now identify what system improvements are needed to build the capacity of LEAs and EIS programs to use the evidence-based practices identified as key to achieving the State-identified measurable result(s) for children with disabilities. How does the State propose to make those system improvements?

- **How will the State support local programs?** How will the State support LEAs and EIS programs in using the evidence-based practices identified as key to achieving desired results for children with disabilities? Phase II of the SSIP needs to detail this information, including activities and timelines.

- **How will the State evaluate implementation?** Each State must also describe how it will evaluate the implementation of its SSIP for Part B and Part C and determine progress toward achieving the State’s desired results and improvements.

Phase 3 (to be completed by 2017)

- **Evaluation!** The evaluation of SSIP implementation continues. So does the State’s reporting, including the extent to which its coherent improvement strategies were implemented in both Parts B and C.

- **Results?** What progress has been made toward achieving the State-identified measurable result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities served under Part C? What progress, for students with disabilities served under Part B?

- **Revisions to the SSIP:** Based on data from the ongoing evaluation and with stakeholder involvement, the State may make revisions to its SSIP for Part B and/or Part C.
Part C Coordinator’s Corner – concluded

So, how does all of this tie into my original thoughts about words? We are always throwing words around and in the coming years there will be even more acronyms and a whole lot of jargon to bust, especially with the move to RDA. But ultimately what do all the words mean? Have we overused the words to the point where we are becoming like the teacher in the Peanuts cartoons, “WAH wah Wah”? Are we just throwing a bunch of random thoughts together and spitting them out to the point that no one understands what they mean? Or do the words we spout have meaning? I am afraid at times we tend to be more like the Peanuts teacher.

Ultimately, it is our goal to improve the lives of young children with disabilities and their families; and in Kansas, we are fortunate to have a wonderful set of local tiny-k programs that will continue to ensure we are doing just that! Thank you for all you do. We will be in touch with opportunities to provide input into this process.

Submitted by Sarah Walters, Part C Coordinator Kansas Department of Health and Environment (785) 296-2245 swalters@kdheks.gov

Contact the Early Childhood Resource Center (ECRC)
(620) 421-6550 ext. 1651 Toll free in Kansas:
(800) 362-0390 ext. 1651 resourcecenter@ku.edu

The ECRC is designed to provide access to a continuously updated collection of materials on topics related to children birth to eight who are identified with special needs. Our entire catalog is searchable online at KITS ECRC. Any person who educates young children birth to eight years of age may borrow from the ECRC, including you! Review the ECRC Checkout Policy for complete details.

Other Lending Library Links
• Kansas State School for the Deaf Lending Library
• Kansas State School for the Blind, Kansas Instructional Resource Center
• TASN Autism and Tertiary Behavior Supports

New To The ECRC for Summer 2014
ECRC Spotlight On
The Incredible Years: A Trouble-Shooting Guide for Parents of Children Aged 2-8
By Webster-Stratton, Carolyn

All children misbehave for a variety of reasons, sometimes simply to test how far they can go or to get the attention they crave. Parents unprepared for this may react with anger, more likely escalating the problem than solving it. Or, they may be overwhelmed by feelings of helplessness.

The Incredible Years is a practical guide, filled with examples of everyday problem situations and concerns, and step-by-step suggestions on how to handle them. Each chapter tackles a different problem with helpful tips and ideas for decreasing unacceptable behavior. It is based on over 12 years of detailed research with more than 1,000 families, as well as the author's personal experience as a child psychologist, teacher and parent.

This book is available separate from The Incredible Years kit and may be borrowed from the KITS Early Childhood Resource Center. Contact Kim Page at resourcecenter@ku.edu or (620) 421-6550, ext. 1638.

This information was taken in part from http://www.incredibleyears.com

SAVE THE DATE:
Summer KSDE TASN Leadership Conference
July 24-25, 2014 in Wichita