

## ESEA FLEXIBILITY PART B MONITORING REPORT

MONITORING VISIT INFORMATION	
<b>State Educational Agency (SEA)</b>	<i>Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE)</i>
<b>Request Approved</b>	<i>July 19, 2012</i>
<b>Request Amended</b>	<i>January, 2013 (Pending Review)</i>
<b>ESEA Flex Monitoring Activity</b>	<i>Part B Onsite Monitoring</i>
<b>Monitoring Review Date(s)</b>	<i>September 10-11, 2013</i>
<b>Exit Conference</b>	<i>October 25, 2013</i>
<b>Interviews Conducted</b>	<i>Brad Nueunswander, Colleen Riley, Scott Myers, Sandy Guidry, Kelly Spurgeon, Lee Jones, Tony Moss, Jane Groff, Crystal Davis, Pat Hill, Mike Ronen, LaNetra Guess, Tate Toedman, Chris Macy, Jeannette Nobo, Kris Shaw, Melissa Fast, Suzie Oertel, Beth Fultz, Phyllis Farrar, Tammy Mitchell, Deb Matthews, Kyle Lord, John Baranski, Suzie Sebring, Bill Bagsbaw, Kayeri Akweks, and Vicki Seeger</i>
<b>U.S. Department of Education (ED) Monitors</b>	<i>Christie Imholt, Sue Rigney, David Guardino, and Angela Tanner-Dean</i>

### OVERVIEW OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY MONITORING

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is committed to supporting State educational agencies (SEAs) as they implement ambitious reform agendas through their approved ESEA flexibility requests. Consistent with this commitment, ED has designed a monitoring process to assess an SEA's implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility and the State-level systems and processes needed to support that implementation.

#### ***Part B Monitoring***

In Part B monitoring, SEA implementation of ESEA flexibility was reviewed across several key areas: State-level Systems and Processes, Principle 1, Principle 2, and Principle 3, as outlined in the *ESEA Flexibility Part B Monitoring Protocol*. In each broad area, ED identified key elements that are required under ESEA flexibility and are likely to lead to increased achievement for students. Through examination of documentation submitted by the SEA and interviews with SEA staff, ED assessed the effectiveness of implementation of ESEA flexibility by identifying the extent to which an SEA:

1. Is ensuring that implementation is occurring consistent with the SEA's approved request and the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility.
2. Is continuing to review and make adjustments to support implementation.
3. Is establishing systems and process to sustain implementation and improvements.

The report contains the following sections:

- *Highlights of the SEA's Implementation*. This section identifies key accomplishments in the SEA's implementation of ESEA flexibility.
- *Status of Implementation of ESEA Flexibility*. This section indicates whether or not the SEA has met expectations for each element of ESEA flexibility.

- *Elements Requiring Next Steps.* When appropriate, this section identifies any elements where the SEA is not meeting expectations and includes Next Steps that the SEA must take to meet expectations.
- *Recommendations to Strengthen Implementation.* This section provides recommendations to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation.
- *Additional Comments.* When appropriate, this section includes any additional information related to the SEA’s implementation of ESEA flexibility not included elsewhere.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY**

The SEA’s work includes the following key accomplishments relating to the implementation of ESEA flexibility and/or efforts to engage in a process of continuous review and analysis, particularly for those elements receiving a comprehensive review:

- Through the use of the Kansas Learning Network (KLN), the Technical Assistance Support Network (TASN), and the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Project, Kansas has been able to align systems and processes already in place within its special education and Title I offices to develop structures to support implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility.
- KSDE makes differentiated and targeted technical assistance available to all LEAs and schools through its TASN, which links individual needs directly to State-vetted service providers through a web-based request for assistance system.
- Across all three principles, KSDE continues to review implementation by soliciting feedback from the field through surveys, focus groups, and examining internal data and makes adjustments based on this information.
- KSDE is developing an accreditation process for all LEAs that moves beyond looking solely at performance on assessments to examine an LEA’s holistic approach to serving the entire student and aligns with the SEA’s work in each of the three principles.

**STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY**

**SEA Systems & Processes**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Monitoring</b> (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Technical Assistance</b> (2.G)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Data Collection &amp; Use</b> (§9304(a)(6))	Meeting Expectations
<b>Family &amp; Community Engagement and Outreach</b> (Implementation Letter)	Meeting Expectations

**Principle 1**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Transition to and Implement College- and Career-ready Standards</b> (1.B)	Meeting Expectations

<b>Element</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Adopt English Language Proficiency Standards</b> (Assurance 2)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Develop and Administer High-Quality Assessments</b> (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations <sup>1</sup>
<b>Develop and Administer Alternate Assessments</b> (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Develop and Administer English Language Proficiency Assessments</b> (Assurance 4)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Annually Reports College-going and College-credit Accumulation Rates</b> (Assurance 5)	Meeting Expectations

### Principle 2

<b>Element</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support</b> (2.A)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Reward Schools</b> (2.C)	Meeting Expectations
<b>Priority Schools</b> (2.D)	Not Meeting Expectations
<b>Focus Schools</b> (2.E)	Not Meeting Expectations
<b>Other Title I Schools</b> (2.F)	Not Meeting Expectations
<b>State and Local Report Cards</b> (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)	Meeting Expectations

### Principle 3

<b>Element</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems</b> (3.B)	Under Review
<b>Principal Evaluation and Support Systems</b> (3.B)	Under Review

### ELEMENTS REQUIRING NEXT STEPS

<b>Element</b>	<b>Priority Schools (2.D)</b>
<b>Summary and Status of</b>	The SEA provided the ESEA flexibility team with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that implementation in non-SIG priority schools is being carried

<sup>1</sup>At the time of Part B monitoring, Kansas was a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) consistent with its commitment in its approved ESEA flexibility request to participate in one of the two State assessment consortia—*i.e.*, PARCC or SBAC. Subsequently, on December 10, 2013, the Kansas State Board of Education voted to have the University of Kansas' Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation develop assessments aligned to the State's college- and career-ready standards, rather than use the assessments developed by SBAC. Because KSDE is no longer participating in SBAC, KSDE must amend its approved request for ESEA flexibility to provide a high-quality plan that details the steps KSDE will take to pilot a high-quality assessment, as defined in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* (available at <http://www.ed.gov/eSEA/flexibility/documents/eSEA-flexibility-acc.doc>), in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013–2014 school year and administer that assessment by the 2014–2015 school year. On December 20, 2013, ED sent KSDE a letter specifying the information that must be included in this high-quality plan.

Element	Priority Schools (2.D)
Implementation	<p>out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request. However, ED's Office of School Turnaround monitored KSDE's implementation of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program on July 30-31, 2012. Based on that monitoring, ED issued findings under the critical elements of Implementation and Monitoring that KSDE is required to address. Subsequently, KSDE submitted documentation in response to the findings in ED's SIG monitoring report and provided additional information to ED through a conference call on November 14, 2013. ED is in process of reviewing documentation submitted by KSDE and reviewed during the conference call to determine if KSDE has satisfactorily addressed those findings and therefore fulfilling expectations for all priority schools.</p>
Next Steps	<p>To ensure that the SEA implements meaningful interventions in its SIG-awarded Tier I and/or Tier II schools consistent with the SIG final requirements, and therefore, may continue to count such schools as priority schools, consistent with the principles and timelines in ESEA Flexibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KSDE will work with the ED's Office of School Turnaround to resolve any remaining findings relating to the monitoring and/or implementation of the SIG models.</li> </ul>

Element	Focus Schools (2.E)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>Although KSDE provided evidence that it has monitored focus schools by reviewing and approving online improvement plans in KansasSTAR, the SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. Under Principle 2, the SEA is required to work to close achievement gaps by publicly identifying Title I schools with the greatest achievement gaps, or in which subgroups are furthest behind, as "focus schools" and ensuring that each LEA implements interventions in each of these schools based on reviews of the specific academic needs of the school and its students. KSDE provided copies of needs assessments that were conducted for all focus schools and plans developed based on those needs. However, based on the needs assessments provided by KSDE and sample focus school plans, there did not appear to be evidence that the needs assessment identifies needs connected to the performance of the bottom 30% which led to the school's identification nor do sample plans in KansaSTAR reflect interventions targeted at supporting the bottom 30% of students. Therefore, the SEA has not provided evidence that it is ensuring LEAs are implementing interventions that work to close the achievement gaps as outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p>
Next Steps	<p>As part of the ESEA flexibility extension process, KSDE will submit to ED a plan describing how it will ensure that LEAs with focus schools are working to close achievement gaps by implementing interventions in each of these schools based on reviews of the specific academic needs of the school and its students.</p>

<b>Element</b>	<b>Other Title I Schools (2.F)</b>
<b>Summary and Status of Implementation</b>	<p>To ensure that other Title I schools make progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps receive incentives and supports KSDE's approved ESEA flexibility request states that KSDE would identify Not Making Progress Schools as those Title I schools that are not making any of the State's four annual measurable objectives (improving achievement, increasing growth, closing the gap, and reducing non-proficient students), as well as for not making the participation rates and graduation rates. These schools would then be notified of their status and required to take a series of steps develop and implement improvement plans.</p> <p>According to KSDE's approved ESEA flexibility request, KSDE would identify these schools when the 2012 assessment results became available. However, with ED's approval, KSDE changed the baseline year for establishing its four AMOs from 2011 to 2012 assessment results, and thus was unable to identify Not Making Progress schools during the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>At the time of Part B monitoring, KSDE had not yet publicly identified its Not Making Progress schools for the 2013-2014 school year because it was still reviewing data. Although KSDE indicated during interviews that it intended to identify these schools and have them develop improvement plans for the 2013-2014 school year, KSDE was not able to provide any documentation identifying these schools or providing evidence that these schools would develop and implement improvement plans during the 2013-2014 school year.</p>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<p>To ensure that KSDE provides supports and incentives to its other Title I schools consistent with its approved request, KSDE will, as part of the ESEA flexibility extension process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• submit 1) evidence demonstrating that it has identified and notified its Not Making Progress schools; 2) a copy of business rules for identifying those Not Making Progress schools that shows how not making participation rate and graduation rate targets are included in their identification; and 3) a plan for ensuring that Not Making Progress schools select implement "research-based interventions and/or strategies that match the identified needs of the district and the Not Making Progress School" as described in its approved request.</li> <li>• provide ED evidence that its Not Making Progress schools are implementing research-based interventions and/or strategies that match the identified needs of the district and the Not Making Progress School as described in its approved request.</li> </ul>

<b>Element</b>	<b>Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)</b>
<b>Summary and Status of Implementation</b>	As indicated in ED's August 14, 2013 letter, KSDE has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the submission of final guidelines that include student growth as a significant factor

<b>Element</b>	<b>Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)</b>
	in its teacher evaluation and support system. This element is being addressed through KSDE's work to address that condition and resolve its high-risk status.
<b>Next Steps</b>	KSDE must resolve its high-risk status and address the outstanding condition on its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED's August 14, 2013 letter and subsequent November 26, 2013 letter.

<b>Element</b>	<b>Principal Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)</b>
<b>Summary and Status of Implementation</b>	As indicated in ED's August 14, 2013 letter, KSDE has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the submission of final guidelines that include student growth as a significant factor in its principal evaluation and support system. This element is being addressed through KSDE's work to address that condition and resolve its high-risk status.
<b>Next Steps</b>	KSDE must resolve its high-risk status and address the outstanding condition on its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED's August 14, 2013 letter and subsequent November 26, 2013 letter.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO STRENGTHEN IMPLEMENTATION

The following recommendations are provided to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation through continuous improvement and the establishment of systems and processes to sustain implementation and improvement.

- KSDE should strengthen its outreach to families of students with disabilities and English Learners, particularly in areas with higher concentrations of English Learners, to ensure these families understand the impact of the implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility on their children.
- Given that KSDE will no longer be administering its alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in the 2013-2014 school year, KSDE should develop a plan to ensure that students who previously took this assessment are prepared to take the general transition assessment.
- KSDE should ensure it is meeting the needs of English Learners and students with disabilities throughout its implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility. In particular, KSDE should consider providing additional supports to all teachers and principals in helping English Learners and students with disabilities access college and career-ready standards.
- KSDE could strengthen its use of disaggregated data to support interventions targeted at subgroups in need and ensure they address the specific areas in need of improvement, particularly for its focus schools.
- KSDE should consider providing additional training to Implementation Coaches, District Facilitators, and members of KITT teams on the turnaround principles as defined in *ESEA Flexibility* to ensure as those individuals support implementation in priority schools they are able to ensure alignment of those interventions with all of the turnaround principles.