CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT
PROGRAMS under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11

KANSAS

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies–State, local, and Federal–is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2010-11 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013

<div align="center">

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

</div>

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
　__X_ Part I, 2010-11　　　　　　　　　　　　　　___Part II, 2010-11

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Kansas State Department of Education

Address:
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182

<div align="center">Person to contact about this report:</div>

Name: Judi Miller

Telephone: 785-296-5081

Fax: 785-296-5867

e-mail: judim@ksde.org

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Judi Miller

_____　　_Friday, March 9, 2012, 4:02:35 PM_
　Signature　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11

PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST

1.1 Standards and Assessment Development

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's pe review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has <u>not</u> made or is <u>not</u> planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Kansas State Board of Education adopted the Common Core Standards at its October 2010 meeting. Academies were conducted in the summer of 2011 to begin working with the field in understanding the new standards. Districts and schools will begin the transition to the new standards in 2011-2012 with new assessments in 2014-2015.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned in 2010-2011.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	20.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments:	

1.2 Participation in State Assessments

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.*

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	240,561		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,020		>97
Asian	6,076		>97
Black or African American	17,747		>97
Hispanic or Latino	38,572		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	364		>97
White	164,625		>97
Two or more races	10,143		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30,824		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,265		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	112,368		>97
Migratory students	2,666		>97
Male	123,612		>97
Female	116,949		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,422	24.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,758	45.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,686	21.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,596	8.5
Total	30,462	

Comments: The Kansas State Department of Education is still verifying data to resolve the discrepancies between 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.3.1.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	240,881		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,034		>97
Asian	5,974		>97
Black or African American	17,843		>97
Hispanic or Latino	38,602		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	359		>97
White	164,869		>97
Two or more races	10,194		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30,934		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,064		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	112,707		>97
Migratory students	2,639	2,545	96.4
Male	123,737		>97
Female	117,144		>97
Comments:			

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,363	24.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,190	43.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	7,495	24.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,549	8.3
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	30,597	
Comments: The Kansas State Department of Education is still verifying data to resolve the discrepancies between 1.2.3, 1.2.4 and 1.3.2.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	101,926		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,300		>97
Asian	2,533		>97
Black or African American	7,489		>97
Hispanic or Latino	15,644		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	142	137	96.5
White	70,692		>97
Two or more races	4,123		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,873	12,359	96.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,214		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	45,308		>97
Migratory students	1,048	1,012	96.6
Male	52,249		>97
Female	49,677		>97
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do <u>not</u> include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,777	39.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,357	35.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,116	17.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	989	8.1
Total	12,239	
Comments: The Kansas State Department of Education is still verifying data to resolve the discrepancies. Some of the data files (i.e. N081) include parent-placed students in the students with disabilities' counts and other files (i.e. N093) exclude them. This may account for some of the discrepancy. In addition, the high school science assessment is a 2-part assessment--Physical Science and Life Science. Some students with disabilities took different "types" of assessments, i.e. one with accommodations and one without accommodations. These students are not included in the counts of "Type of		

Assessment."

1.3 Student Academic Achievement

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do <u>not</u> include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,656	30,976	89.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	349	312	89.4
Asian	953	891	93.5
Black or African American	2,596	1,980	76.3
Hispanic or Latino	6,068	5,106	84.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	48	81.4
White	22,970	21,170	92.2
Two or more races	1,661	1,469	88.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,755	3,756	79.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,305	3,549	82.4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,899	15,097	84.3
Migratory students	426	349	81.9
Male	17,752	15,897	89.6
Female	16,904	15,079	89.2
Comments:			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,632	29,929	86.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	353	301	85.3
Asian	935	818	87.5
Black or African American	2,596	1,924	74.1
Hispanic or Latino	6,042	4,678	77.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	49	84.5
White	22,985	20,722	90.2
Two or more races	1,663	1,437	86.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,758	3,656	76.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,235	3,126	73.8
Economically disadvantaged students	17,888	14,347	80.2
Migratory students	417	304	72.9
Male	17,731	15,104	85.2
Female	16,901	14,825	87.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: The Kansas Science Assessment is given in grades 4, 7 and in the high school by the end of grade 11.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,978	30,894	88.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	386	326	84.5
Asian	893	831	93.1
Black or African American	2,493	1,881	75.5
Hispanic or Latino	6,101	5,052	82.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	32	84.2
White	23,485	21,435	91.3
Two or more races	1,582	1,337	84.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,930	3,794	77.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,044	3,275	81.0
Economically disadvantaged students	17,561	14,544	82.8
Migratory students	420	338	80.5
Male	17,927	15,912	88.8
Female	17,051	14,982	87.9
Comments:			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,976	31,411	89.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	386	339	87.8
Asian	881	802	91.0
Black or African American	2,494	1,955	78.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,074	5,013	82.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	32	86.5
White	23,522	21,851	92.9
Two or more races	1,582	1,419	89.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,940	3,954	80.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,978	3,148	79.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,544	14,819	84.5
Migratory students	411	314	76.4
Male	17,927	15,915	88.8
Female	17,049	15,496	90.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,979	32,610	93.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	384		n<
Asian	894	825	92.3
Black or African American	2,498	2,000	80.1
Hispanic or Latino	6,114	5,266	86.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38		≥90
White	23,465	22,660	96.6
Two or more races	1,586	1,473	92.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,916	4,132	84.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,051	3,330	82.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,555	15,589	88.8
Migratory students	417	340	81.5
Male	17,929	16,753	93.4
Female	17,050	15,857	93.0
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,831	30,460	87.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	437	371	84.9
Asian	905	829	91.6
Black or African American	2,528	1,876	74.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,944	4,776	80.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	36	81.8
White	23,446	21,272	90.7
Two or more races	1,527	1,300	85.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,668	3,417	73.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,820	2,934	76.8
Economically disadvantaged students	17,147	13,885	81.0
Migratory students	407	312	76.7
Male	17,982	15,787	87.8
Female	16,849	14,673	87.1
Comments:			

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,850	30,439	87.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	440	377	85.7
Asian	878	766	87.2
Black or African American	2,536	1,903	75.0
Hispanic or Latino	5,930	4,592	77.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	35	79.5
White	23,491	21,423	91.2
Two or more races	1,531	1,343	87.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,689	3,488	74.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,753	2,681	71.4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,161	13,839	80.6
Migratory students	403	280	69.5
Male	17,992	15,597	86.7
Female	16,858	14,842	88.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: The Kansas Science Assessment is given in grades 4, 7 and in the high school by the end of grade 11.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,448	29,164	84.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	445	344	77.3
Asian	798	706	88.5
Black or African American	2,586	1,610	62.3
Hispanic or Latino	5,565	4,193	75.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	62	54	87.1
White	23,542	21,109	89.7
Two or more races	1,450	1,148	79.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,457	3,003	67.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,330	2,344	70.4
Economically disadvantaged students	16,438	12,509	76.1
Migratory students	431	305	70.8
Male	17,874	15,044	84.2
Female	16,574	14,120	85.2
Comments:			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,498	30,333	87.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	446	377	84.5
Asian	778	679	87.3
Black or African American	2,613	1,837	70.3
Hispanic or Latino	5,543	4,370	78.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	62	54	87.1
White	23,600	21,784	92.3
Two or more races	1,456	1,232	84.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,471	3,324	74.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,269	2,326	71.2
Economically disadvantaged students	16,487	13,230	80.2
Migratory students	420	296	70.5
Male	17,889	15,479	86.5
Female	16,609	14,854	89.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: The Kansas Science Assessment is given in grades 4, 7 and in the high school by the end of grade 11.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,427	28,383	82.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	490	360	73.5
Asian	864	776	89.8
Black or African American	2,576	1,631	63.3
Hispanic or Latino	5,450	3,938	72.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	64	51	79.7
White	23,564	20,510	87.0
Two or more races	1,419	1,117	78.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,288	2,773	64.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,942	1,946	66.1
Economically disadvantaged students	15,981	11,671	73.0
Migratory students	408	284	69.6
Male	17,630	14,338	81.3
Female	16,797	14,045	83.6
Comments:			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,468	30,914	89.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	495	416	84.0
Asian	848	760	89.6
Black or African American	2,591	1,994	77.0
Hispanic or Latino	5,435	4,401	81.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	49	77.8
White	23,612	22,026	93.3
Two or more races	1,424	1,268	89.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,307	3,244	75.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,887	2,073	71.8
Economically disadvantaged students	16,014	13,285	83.0
Migratory students	402	291	72.4
Male	17,662	15,547	88.0
Female	16,806	15,367	91.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,296	28,897	84.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	489	378	77.3
Asian	844	708	83.9
Black or African American	2,564	1,518	59.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,377	3,748	69.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	62	50	80.6
White	23,549	21,338	90.6
Two or more races	1,411	1,157	82.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,264	2,850	66.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,878	1,675	58.2
Economically disadvantaged students	15,863	11,738	74.0
Migratory students	405	269	66.4
Male	17,560	15,098	86.0
Female	16,736	13,799	82.5
Comments:			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,329	27,391	82.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	449	348	77.5
Asian	846	753	89.0
Black or African American	2,406	1,542	64.1
Hispanic or Latino	5,082	3,592	70.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	52	37	71.2
White	23,136	20,043	86.6
Two or more races	1,358	1,076	79.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,843	2,389	62.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,439	1,520	62.3
Economically disadvantaged students	14,803	10,745	72.6
Migratory students	349	232	66.5
Male	17,014	13,836	81.3
Female	16,315	13,555	83.1
Comments:			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,366	29,339	87.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	452	371	82.1
Asian	824	716	86.9
Black or African American	2,417	1,776	73.5
Hispanic or Latino	5,062	3,909	77.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	52	40	76.9
White	23,195	21,343	92.0
Two or more races	1,364	1,184	86.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,880	2,724	70.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,382	1,552	65.2
Economically disadvantaged students	14,832	11,871	80.0
Migratory students	341	234	68.6
Male	17,045	14,858	87.2
Female	16,321	14,481	88.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: The Kansas Science Assessment is given in grades 4, 7 and in the high school by the end of grade 11.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,434	26,634	82.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	431	321	74.5
Asian	825	712	86.3
Black or African American	2,368	1,393	58.8
Hispanic or Latino	4,004	2,834	70.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	43	27	62.8
White	23,677	20,495	86.6
Two or more races	1,072	838	78.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,587	2,185	60.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,179	684	58.0
Economically disadvantaged students	11,598	8,210	70.8
Migratory students	200	115	57.5
Male	16,623	13,637	82.0
Female	15,811	12,997	82.2
Comments:			

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,479	28,886	88.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	440	386	87.7
Asian	788	671	85.2
Black or African American	2,416	1,818	75.2
Hispanic or Latino	4,038	3,197	79.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39	31	79.5
White	23,653	21,804	92.2
Two or more races	1,099	973	88.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,625	2,660	73.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,140	691	60.6
Economically disadvantaged students	11,748	9,530	81.1
Migratory students	190	123	64.7
Male	16,615	14,625	88.0
Female	15,864	14,261	89.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	31,175	26,962	86.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	396	335	84.6
Asian	776	666	85.8
Black or African American	2,241	1,400	62.5
Hispanic or Latino	3,820	2,806	73.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	29	78.4
White	22,835	20,810	91.1
Two or more races	1,067	913	85.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,189	2,124	66.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,105	663	60.0
Economically disadvantaged students	10,943	8,368	76.5
Migratory students	201	130	64.7
Male	15,936	13,960	87.6
Female	15,239	13,002	85.3
Comments:			

1.4 School and District Accountability

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	1,366	1,149	84.1
Districts	289	211	73.0
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11 . Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	668	558	83.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	339	264	77.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	329	294	89.4
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
290	211	72.8
Comments: There were 289 districts in 2010-2011 that received Title I funds. We understand that the US Department of Education provided the information for the CSPR on the number of Title I districts receiving funds. Two districts consolidated into one district which is not reflected on the ED's list of schools. This may explain the difference between 1.4.1 and 1.4.3.		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

---

[1] The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program 1 Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school' low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
Comments: The following selections have been named as the other areas being implemented to address restructuring needs: Curriculum alignment; AIMS Web; Pre/Post Course Unit Tests; District Formatives; America's Choice; Positive Behavior Supports; Screener Diagnostics; Walk-Throughs.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action [2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

---

[2] The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kansas System of District and School Support has defined the expectations for technical assistance through the school improvement process. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff assists districts and schools in year one of improvement in writing district and school integrated improvement plans, understanding choice and ensuring 10% of Title I funds are set aside for professional development. The KSDE also assists with peer reviews of the integrated improvement plans and provides technical assistance through phone calls, emails, webinars and face-to-face visits. The KSDE staff review the integrated improvement plans and return them to districts and schools with constructive feedback.

Every district that is on improvement or has schools on improvement participates in the Kansas Learning Network (KLN). This collaborative approach to district and school improvement uses state and federal funds to support the participation of all districts that have been identified as "needing improvement" under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Each district is assigned a district facilitator who assists the superintendent and district leadership team in the writing and implementation of the district integrated improvement plan. Districts which have individual schools identified as on improvement are assigned a school implementation coach to serve as a "critical friend" in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. In the fall of each school year, each district participates in a KLN District Needs Appraisal Visit. The process begins with an intense 2 or 3 day appraisal of the district based on the KLN correlates to support systemic alignment of all district systems. This is done through contracted services by Cross & Joftus, Inc. with help from the KSDE staff and colleagues from other participating districts. During the visit focused classroom walkthroughs are completed in PreK-12 classrooms and a calibration process is used to ensure there is consensus among the observing team. The KLN needs appraisal process provides feedback to district staff, teachers, and administrators based on interviews, focus groups, surveys, and classroom observations to inform future management, teaching, and learning practices. A unique nature of the needs appraisal is that the data collected during classroom visits are used to focus the work of educators in professional learning communities as they examine what instructional practices have the greatest impact on advancing achievement and what opportunities need to be provided to access the next learning levels. This information coupled with the feedback collected during interviews, focus groups, and surveys provide critical direction for strategic planning and continuous improvement initiatives. A final report highlighting district strengths and challenges is shared with the district and the results of the needs analysis become the foundation of the district's improvement plan.

There have been several changes to the KLN Network technical assistance for the 2011-2012 school year. There are no longer KLN Cohort Meetings (5 cohorts currently)which were held four times during the previous year. This year districts will participate in a KLN Community of Practice (CoP). CoPs for district and school leaders will encompass the following areas: Curriculum and Formative Assessments (including transitioning to the Common Core); Instructional Framework, Classroom Observations, and Use of Data to Improve Instruction; and, Tiered Interventions. Communities of Practice are managed by a Cross & Joftus consultant who works closely with an appropriate KSDE director and/or consultant. CoPs will enable KLN to facilitate districts' sharing of resources and collaborative support of progress and to build on the momentum generated by current KLN participants. Beginning in January 2012, each CoP will meet twice a year (in two different locations for regional convenience) and hold approximately four webinars featuring a participating district(s) and/or expert to promote implementation of key practices in the CoP area. Districts will also be required to track and report on their own progress in implementing pre-defined practices along with formative evaluation results of the impact of those practices. Districts will be encouraged to contact peers and the CoP manager via phone, email and the KLN Basecamp for continuous support throughout the year. There will be other opportunities, such as the teacher evaluation project (KEEP) and the math focal point assessment project that districts may choose to participate in during the year. The other major change for the 2011-12 school year, in recognition of the need to help build the capacity of Kansas -based organization to conduct high-quality district needs appraisals and sustain the KLN process in future years, the KSDE has selected approximately 20 Kansas Learning Network Fellows to receive training in conducting needs appraisals for new districts on improvement. In the 2011-12 school year, approximately 12 districts entering improvement for the first time will receive a two- or three-day visit during which a team of experts and peers will implement a research-based process to identify strengths and weaknesses of the instructional delivery and support systems; determine the systemic coherence of the district; and develop the capacity of administrators and teachers to improve instruction on a continuous basis. Each Kansas Learning Network Fellow will participate in two of these appraisals after receiving two days of intensive preparation and training with experience district appraisal facilitators. In the spirit of continuous learning and improvement, the KLN needs appraisal process was designed to be used by participants again and again in the hope that the process will become institutionalized within each district so that reflection policy and practice adjustment occur at all levels throughout the year.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	4
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	6	5
Schools	3	1
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	07/18/11

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g)Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Please refer to 1.4.5.2 for information on the KSDE's technical assistance that is provided to districts and schools on improvement, corrective action and in restructuring. In addition to this information, the KSDE facilitates the 1003(g) SIG grants. There are six schools in 5 districts that are in the second year of the SIG grant. Title Programs & Services staff monitors the implementation of these grants in the fall and spring. This year one new SIG grant was approved and is being implemented. An initial monitoring visit was held this fall. Monitoring visits for the rest of the year will be completed in late spring. Conference calls, email correspondence and phone calls are other ways the KSDE provides technical assistance to these schools.

As mentioned in 1.4.5.2 the Kansas Learning Network is a partner that works with districts and schools by providing technical assistance through a variety of avenues. In order to ensure the services they're providing are truly impacting district/school performance and student achievement, an annual evaluation is done. The evaluation process is facilitated by the George Washington University. All components of the KLN Network are evaluated which is guided by specific research questions: To what extent are the stakeholders in the program satisfied with the implementation and progress of the program? To what degree has student achievement increased in schools with ICs? If so, what are the most likely factors resulting in the increase? What are some of the key challenges that the program faces and how can they be addressed in the future? The researchers reviewed research related to district leadership, school leadership and student achievement as well as the roles of coaches in district/school improvement plans, including the impact of these programs on student achievement.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2010-11 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No funds were given.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	14,945
Applied to transfer	773
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	769
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 891,955

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	3

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

  In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

  For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

3 Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	7,419
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,899
Received supplemental educational services	2,412
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 3,005,321
Comments:	

1.5 Teacher Quality

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are **NOT** Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are **NOT** Highly Qualified
All classes	80,013	77,933	97.4	2,080	2.6
All elementary classes	16,745	16,587	99.1	158	0.9
All secondary classes	63,268	61,346	97.0	1,922	3.0

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Self-contained classrooms were counted one time; departmentalized classrooms were counted as one time per subject.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	67.6
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	20.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reporting through the Licensed Personnel Report (LPR) and Kansas Course Codes Management System (KCCMS) was changed for more accurate reporting.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	55.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reporting through the Licensed Personnel Report (LPR) and Kansas Course Codes Management System (KCCMS) was changed for more accurate reporting.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	4,974	4,908	98.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,207	4,177	99.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	16,947	16,303	96.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	20,039	19,678	98.2

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	58.0	26.0
Poverty metric used	Poverty was calculated using free and reduced-price meal status.	
Secondary schools	45.0	22.0
Poverty metric used	Poverty was calculated using free and reduced-price meal status.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III and Language Instructional Programs

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs =** Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	N/A
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Newcomer programs are designed for intensive, short-term English support. English Language Learners (ELLs) then enter other ESOL programs in the districts. There are also push-in programs in which a paraprofessional or English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)-endorsed teacher goes into the classroom with the ELL to provide language support.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	43,454
Comments:	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the underlined number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	33,093
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	35,549
Undetermined	2,808
Vietnamese	1,352
German	590
Chinese	574

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Lao (664) and Arabic (601) are the two languages following German. Next year High and Low German will be separated so the German count may look different. EDEN auto-upload of data includes aggregated languages as a single language. That number is reflected above as "Undetermined."

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121 (a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	40,594
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,532
Total	43,126
Comments: Kansas recognizes that the number of English Language Learners (ELLs) not tested on the annual ELP assessment is too high. Some ELs are excluded from testing for medical reasons and some are classified as "nongraded." The nongraded students are included in the total ELL count but they are excluded from the testing as they are students in alternative schools who were previously counted as dropouts and who are enrolled again or are adults between 18-21. The KSDE conducted an audit of the assessment to determine which districts are not assessing all ELLs. KSDE will follow up with these districts to ensure they are administering the ELP assessment to all ELLs. In addition, KSDE increased communications to all districts regarding the requirements to test ELLs with the ELP assessment.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	12,994
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	32.0
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	31,066
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,853
Total	32,919
Comments: Refer to the comments on previous question 1.6.3.1.1 as the same reasons apply.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,114

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	19,652	67.9	4,706	24.00
Attained proficiency	10,161	32.7	1,826	18.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One =** Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two =** Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total =** Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
438	581	1,019
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
422	387	91.7	35
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
426	391	91.8	35
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
171	152	88.9	19
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do <u>not</u> leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do <u>not</u> double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do <u>not</u> include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	49
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	47
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	47
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	39
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	1

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Consortia members are not counted as a subgrantee, only the consortium as a whole. Individual districts are held accountable for meeting AMAOs, however.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	Yes
Comments: State Met all three Title III AMAOs	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: N/A	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants =** Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,745	956	3

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term μLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	179
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics =** Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees =** Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants =** Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	49	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	49	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	49	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	49	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	49	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	49	6,261
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	49	948
PD provided to principals	49	325
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	196
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	49	595
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	71
Total	250	8,396

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the <u>intended</u> <u>school year</u>. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

<u>Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:</u>

1. **Date State Received Allocation =** Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees =** Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/$$ Distribution =** Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/7/10	7/9/10	8
Comments:		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to

subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The process has already been shortened. Districts would receive the funds sooner if the State received its allocation by July 1 each year.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

1.8 Graduation Rates and Dropout Rates

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	67.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	65.3
Hispanic	70.1
White, non-Hispanic	84.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	67.9
Limited English proficient	66.7
Economically disadvantaged	69.6
Migratory students	68.8
Male	78.3
Female	82.5
Comments: The graduation data was calculated using the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate methodology. As a result, there were significant declines in the rates. EDEN file N041 asked for the data by Pacific Islander (PI7) and Asian (AS7) rather than combined. The graduation rate for Pacific Islander's is 71.2 and the rate for Asian is 86.6. Kansas also calculates a multi-racial rate and that is 71.6.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

  a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
       - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
       - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
       - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
  b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2.6
Hispanic	1.8
White, non-Hispanic	1.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1.5
Limited English proficient	1.5
Economically disadvantaged	1.7
Migratory students	1.9
Male	1.6
Female	1.1
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	279	279
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	289	289
Comments:		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	109	n<
K	350	583
1	412	491
2	391	473
3	311	479
4	319	428
5	279	405
6	255	399
7	279	348
8	223	295
9	208	362
10	204	295
11	181	203
12	294	264
Ungraded	12	n<
Total	3,827	5,168
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	325	367
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,268	4,555
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	58	26
Hotels/Motels	176	220
Total	3,827	5,168
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	n<
K	583
1	491
2	473
3	479
4	428
5	405
6	399
7	348
8	295
9	362
10	295
11	203
12	264
Ungraded	n<
Total	5,168
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	214
Migratory children/youth	152
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	831
Limited English proficient students	880
Comments:	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	580	405
4	561	429
5	508	397
6	496	338
7	465	354
8	377	278
High School	272	207
Comments:		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	587	448
4	569	420
5	514	380
6	503	312
7	469	292
8	380	247
High School	267	161
Comments:		

1.10 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes.*

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do <u>not</u> include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	342
K	438
1	387
2	412
3	362
4	324
5	350
6	347
7	311
8	269
9	354
10	274
11	190
12	122
Ungraded	34
Out-of-school	2,723
Total	7,239
Comments:	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No increase/decrease of 10% or more exists from the FFY2010 to FFY2011 migrant child count data.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the underduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	49
K	63
1	85
2	64
3	74
4	58
5	53
6	55
7	42
8	47
9	37
10	33
11	n<
12	n<
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	67
Total	751
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE)verified the data to be correct. The increase in the Category 2 Child Count is a result of efforts to increase the number of projects sponsoring summer services to migrant eligible children. During the summer of 2011, an additional 4 migrant projects provided summer services than did during the summer of 2010.

During the fall of 2009, KSDE Migrant staff worked collaboratively with the Information Technology team to implement the transition plan. This transition plan included various testing and data queries to ensure no data was lost or duplicated when migrated to the new Migrant Data System.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As previously noted the Kansas Migrant Data System was deployed in January 2010 and used to generate the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 CSPR reports.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? <u>If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please</u> describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> The same procedures and data system are used to generate the Category I and Category 2 Child Counts. LEAs are asked to enter the summer services data into the Migrant System as soon as services are provided during the summer for the time period of June 1, 2011 through August 31, 2011.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> The Kansas Certificate of Eligibility Approval Team, state level recruiters, and district staff are required to input and update data (e.g. initiate COE, deactivate COE, priority for services, course completion) in the web-based Migrant System. All users are provided a user name and password to access the secure Migrant System based on their user level status. The Migrant System menu and help files instruct users on how to navigate and accurately input data. The System saves the data to the database which is used to generate discrepancy reports so that districts then access their data to initiate updates and corrections. The Migrant System and the KIDS Student Information System are web-based and in real time so data and reports such as the Category I Child Count, are updated instantaneously to ensure an unduplicated count. Data are organized through various ad hoc reports that the user can generate via the advanced search parameters (e.g., dates, names, COE status, grades, district enrollment, etc.). In addition, no new or recertified child is entered into the Migrant database without COE submission and approval by the state level COE Approval Team. State MEP staff generates periodic child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 throughout the year as a quality control measure to monitor and ensure data reporting accuracy.

<u>If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who–in the case of Category 2–received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The compilation process for the Category I Count included the children who met the eligibility criteria and had a qualifying move that occurred through the following time period:

Current Year 9-1-2010 through 8-31-2011
Previous 12 Months 8-15-2009 through 8-31-2010
Previous 24 Months 8-15-2008 through 8-14-2009
Previous 36 Months 8-15-2007 through 8-14-2008

Kansas ensures unduplicated Category I and Category II Child Counts by assigning a unique identifier via the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) data system and written procedures for each child entered into the Migrant System. If a child moves from one Kansas district to another Kansas district, the Migrant System is designed to automatically close out the old COE immediately when a newly approved COE is entered into the System. This further ensures the Migrant child count is unduplicated.

In creating reports for the Category I and Category II Child Counts, stored SQL procedures aligned with the EDEN file specifications within the Migrant System ensure an accurate child count each year. Data is filtered so no child is counted unless he/she is between the ages of 3-21 during the reporting period. KIDS enrollment records are used to verify whether each child was in the state during the reporting period. If a child has two history lines in the KIDS database for the same time period, only one line is counted per ID#. KSDE staff also query the Migrant database and generate multiple reports to ensure records are up to date, accurate, and unduplicated.

The same process is used to ensure unduplicated counts for both the Category I and Category 2 reports.

If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4
1. Kansas has a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information (e.g. COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewers(s)) which includes the following:

On July 1, 2010 Kansas implemented a new MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan that has increased child find activities. This plan included the addition of over 20 state level recruiters who are employed year round in order to recruit within the school districts as well as in areas outside of the school district and educational settings. Among the staff identified within the MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan, there is a MEP State Director, a MEP Director for Identification and Recruitment, and Monitoring/Technical Assistance and Quality Control Coordinators.

The Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is initially entered into the Migrant System by the state level recruiters. Until it is verified and approved, no COE data is moved into the child count component of the Migrant System. During the review process, the COE information, if necessary, is sent back to the state level recruiter to correct data anomalies and resubmit. Data regarding COE anomalies are tracked within the Migrant System and are used in the training of state level recruiters. It should be noted that Kansas uses the National Certificate of Eligibility form.

Additional quality control measures have been implemented to ensure all COE data is accurate and eligible children are appropriately identified. This includes a formal COE approval process that is tracked within the Migrant Data System. Each COE entered into the System by the state recruiters is reviewed by the COE Approval Team comprised of four reviewers experienced in Migrant Education and trained on the most current COE statutes and regulations. Each COE undergoes an individual review three times by three separate COE Approval Team members. A final evaluation is conducted by a fourth and final COE Approval Team member who is responsible for the actual state eligibility approval.

2. The SEA reviews student attendance at summer /intersession projects.

Since the Migrant projects responsible for entering data into the Migrant Data System during the summer are the same as during the regular school year, and the procedures to enter data are the same for Category I and Category 2 reports, no additional review of student attendance in summer projects is deemed necessary.

3. The SEA has a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions.

No local eligibility process for resolving eligibility questions is necessary as Kansas utilizes a single state-level process for determining eligibility and resolving eligibility questions. Additional quality control measures have been implemented to ensure all COE data is accurate and eligible children are appropriately identified. This includes a formal COE approval process that is tracked within the Migrant System. Each COE entered into the System by the state recruiters is reviewed by the COE Approval Team comprised of four reviewers experienced in Migrant Education and trained on the most current COE statutes and regulations. Each COE undergoes an individual review three times by three separate COE Approval Team members. A final evaluation is conducted by a fourth and final COE Approval Team member who is responsible for the actual state eligibility approval. Any eligibility questions that cannot be resolved by the COE Approval Team are forwarded to the State Director who makes a final determination or seeks further guidance from the Office of Migrant Education at the US Department of Education.

4. The SEA periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures.

Kansas periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruiting efforts by reviewing the number of approved COES by state recruiter and by city, and state regions. Mass recruiting occurs throughout the year across the state in high density areas where agricultural businesses exist. These practices have resulted in revision to recruitment procedures. Kansas is currently in the process of conducting an independent formal evaluation of the effectiveness of recruitment efforts.

5. Written procedures are provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment

Since data for the Category I and Category 2 Child Count are entered by the same district staff and collected in the same method, no need exists to provide additional procedures for summer/intersession. Written procedures are in place for

inputting data into the Migrant Data System and available online.

6. Records/data entry personnel are provided training at least annually on how to review summer/intersession site records, input data, and run reports for child count purposes.

Numerous trainings and technical assistance are provided throughout the year to ensure data clerks are utilizing these written procedures. The State of Kansas conducts ongoing training sessions for recruitment and data clerk staff to re-train existing employees, train new employees, and discuss significant issues. Multiple training sessions are held for district data clerks. This professional development is provided through face to face meetings as well as web-based training modules designed to target specific data entry procedures. The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has developed a Data Quality Certification (DQC) program with specialized tracks for data entry personnel, data coordinators, program staff, and administrators. These tracks include instruction on general data quality practices and techniques, as well as intensive role-based training with the KSDE web-based applications, including the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) system, and their support resources.

A track for the Migrant System and Migrant data collection procedures has been developed and integrated within the DQC program. Monthly and quarterly trainings are conducted with state recruiting staff responsible for entering COE data. Since the new Migrant System tracks the COE process electronically, state level review to identify patterns and concerns of data entry errors is ongoing, and technical assistance can be targeted and corrected at the individual recruiter level. All migrant data are examined at the state level for accuracy and completeness, as well as whether migrant projects are entering data in a timely manner

Reinterviews were conducted face to face.

The 2011 calendar year required the State to conduct an independent reinterview study. In order to implement the required 2011 SEA independent re-interview process, the Kansas Migrant Education Program joined a consortium of three States (Kansas, Nebraska and New York) to integrate human and financial resources, deliver the re-interviewing protocol, and assess the findings from each State. As stated in the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing (September 2009), "a basic prospective re-interviewing approach would use a statewide random sample of 50 migrant children to check for possible errors or developing problems." The director was kept abreast of the independent reinterview study activities to ensure it was conducted according to requirements.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Refer to the first comment box on 1.10.3.4

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and–for systems that merge data–consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Refer to the first comment box on 1.10.3.4

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Refer to the first comment box on 1.10.3.4

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Refer to the first comment box on 1.10.3.4

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Refer to the first comment box on 1.10.3.4