CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

KANSAS

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) 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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

  _X_ Part I, 2008-09   ___Part II, 2008-09

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

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

Person to contact about this report:

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 5, 2010, 3:31:28 PM_

    Signature   Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

NoChild
LeftBehind

**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
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 peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school 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 content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Kansas plans on adopting the Common Core Standards for Math and English Language Arts. The timeline for adoption is Summer 2010. We expect to implement the new standards as soon as they are approved by the USDE.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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 or reading/language arts 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 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 <u>not</u> 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 changes are planned at this time.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below 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 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 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.

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."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No changes are planned at this time.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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 withESEA. 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	237,298		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,173		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,032		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	18,688		>97%
Hispanic	30,184		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	168,312		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	31,183		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,887		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	99,482		>97%
Migratory students	1,173		>97%
Male	121,775		>97%
Female	115,523		>97%
Comments: 1.2.1 pulled data from EDEN file 81. This file excludes "Medical Emergency" students. Some of these students, who took some parts of the assessment, are included in file 93 which is used to populate 1.2.2.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	11,160	36.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10,494	33.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,842	22.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,492	8.0
Total	30,988	
Comments: 1.2.1 pulled data from EDEN file 81. This file excludes "Medical Emergency" students. Some of these students, who took some parts of the assessment, are included in file 93 which is used to populate 1.2.2.		

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	237,599		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,203		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,951		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	18,773		>97%
Hispanic	30,159		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	168,555		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	31,316		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,673		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	99,714		>97%
Migratory students	1,146		>97%
Male	121,894		>97%
Female	115,705		>97%
Comments: 1.2.3 pulled data from EDEN file 81. This file excludes "Medical Emergency" students. Some of these students, who took some parts of the assessment and were assigned a performance level, are included in file 93 which is used to populate 1.2.4.			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

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 <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	11,102	35.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,850	31.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	7,688	24.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,454	7.9
Total	31,094	
Comments: 1.2.3 pulled data from EDEN file 81. This file excludes "Medical Emergency" students. Some of these students, who took some parts of the assessment, are included in file 93 which is used to populate 1.2.4.		

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	99,496		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,279		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,487		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	7,683		>97%
Hispanic	11,893		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	71,921		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,684		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,471		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	39,107		>97%
Migratory students	419		>97%
Male	51,042		>97%
Female	48,454		>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 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	6,192	49.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,021	24.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,327	18.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	858	6.9
Total	12,398	
Comments: The high school science assessment is in 2 parts. Some students took different test types for each part so they are not included in any category. That is why the numbers is table 1.2.6 is 13 students less than in 1.2.5.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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 not 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	34,797	30,681	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	467	393	84.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	944	864	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,697	1,951	72.3
Hispanic	4,994	4,045	81.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,727	21,740	91.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,811	3,740	77.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,818	3,016	79.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,398	13,452	82.0
Migratory students	189	137	72.5
Male	17,956	15,902	88.6
Female	16,841	14,779	87.8
Comments: The number of students in the race and ethnicity categories does not equal the "All Students" category. The data are pulled from the EDFacts EDEN files 75, 78 and 79 which allowed for "MM-Multicultural, Multiethnic or Multiracial." The CSPR excludes this category which results in a difference in race/ethnicity totals. This is true for all grade levels of the reading, mathematics and science assessments in the CSPR Section 1.3. This discrepancy was brought to V. Hammer's (SASA offices) attention on 3-3-2010.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	34,767	29,751	85.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	470	391	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	923	782	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,698	1,900	70.4
Hispanic	4,962	3,598	72.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,746	21,446	90.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,820	3,727	77.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,663	2,501	68.3
Economically disadvantaged students	16,370	12,739	77.8
Migratory students	183	132	72.1
Male	17,923	15,174	84.7
Female	16,844	14,577	86.5
Comments: The number of students in the race and ethnicity categories does not equal the "All Students" category. The data are pulled from the EDFacts EDEN files 75, 78 and 79 which allowed for "MM-Multicultural, Multiethnic or Multiracial." The CSPR excludes this category which results in a difference in race/ethnicity totals. This is true for all grade levels of the reading, mathematics and science assessments in the CSPR Section 1.3.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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	34,371	29,868	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	473	394	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	867	797	91.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2,755	1,928	70.0
Hispanic	4,693	3,643	77.6
White, non-Hispanic	23,708	21,542	90.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,860	3,616	74.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,403	2,555	75.1
Economically disadvantaged students	15,780	12,604	79.9
Migratory students	187	159	85.0
Male	17,823	15,535	87.2
Female	16,548	14,333	86.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	34,327	30,089	87.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	472	400	84.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	848	749	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,755	1,948	70.7
Hispanic	4,631	3,506	75.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,736	21,868	92.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,883	3,715	76.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,254	2,308	70.9
Economically disadvantaged students	15,718	12,603	80.2
Migratory students	180	142	78.9
Male	17,820	15,438	86.6
Female	16,507	14,651	88.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	34,382	31,601	91.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	473	436	92.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	870	801	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	2,757	2,097	76.1
Hispanic	4,710	3,814	81.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,692	22,732	96.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,839	4,008	82.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,410	2,623	76.9
Economically disadvantaged students	15,782	13,590	86.1
Migratory students	185	156	84.3
Male	17,833	16,441	92.2
Female	16,549	15,160	91.6
Comments: The number of students in the race and ethnicity categories does not equal the "All Students" category. The data are pulled from the EDFacts EDEN files 75, 78 and 79 which allowed for "MM-Multicultural, Multiethnic or Multiracial." The CSPR excludes this category which results in a difference in race/ethnicity totals. This is true for all grade levels of the reading, mathematics and science assessments in the CSPR Section 1.3.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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	34,035	29,644	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	453	369	81.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	889	814	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,742	1,987	72.5
Hispanic	4,650	3,652	78.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,535	21,316	90.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,746	3,463	73.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,085	2,300	74.6
Economically disadvantaged students	15,293	12,280	80.3
Migratory students	198	156	78.8
Male	17,398	15,194	87.3
Female	16,637	14,450	86.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	34,049	28,907	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	458	371	81.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	878	771	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,749	1,947	70.8
Hispanic	4,626	3,250	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	23,560	21,108	89.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,761	3,490	73.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,938	1,879	64.0
Economically disadvantaged students	15,302	11,680	76.3
Migratory students	192	132	68.8
Male	17,401	14,650	84.2
Female	16,648	14,257	85.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The science assessment is given in gra	des 4, 7 and 11.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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	33,044	27,504	83.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	443	353	79.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	897	776	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,587	1,553	60.0
Hispanic	4,272	3,021	70.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,361	20,618	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,236	2,817	66.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,469	1,522	61.6
Economically disadvantaged students	14,243	10,371	72.8
Migratory students	173	120	69.4
Male	16,942	14,191	83.8
Female	16,102	13,313	82.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	33,089	28,752	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	444	364	82.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	881	759	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2,601	1,790	68.8
Hispanic	4,254	3,171	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,418	21,385	91.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,260	3,188	74.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,333	1,497	64.2
Economically disadvantaged students	14,259	11,209	78.6
Migratory students	169	127	75.2
Male	16,957	14,567	85.9
Female	16,132	14,185	87.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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	33,629	27,028	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	458	333	72.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	851	736	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,602	1,595	61.3
Hispanic	4,142	2,652	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	24,100	20,573	85.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,353	2,627	60.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,231	1,216	54.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,749	9,421	68.5
Migratory students	154	106	68.8
Male	17,211	13,565	78.8
Female	16,418	13,463	82.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	33,630	29,743	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	464	385	83.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	822	739	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2,620	1,933	73.8
Hispanic	4,113	3,117	75.8
White, non-Hispanic	24,124	22,286	92.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,358	3,235	74.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,111	1,376	65.2
Economically disadvantaged students	13,749	10,965	79.8
Migratory students	153	113	73.9
Male	17,201	14,949	86.9
Female	16,429	14,794	90.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	33,620	28,043	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	465	376	80.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	851	705	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,592	1,525	58.8
Hispanic	4,138	2,539	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	24,093	21,721	90.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,340	2,884	66.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,227	1,077	48.4
Economically disadvantaged students	13,748	9,774	71.1
Migratory students	153	100	65.4
Male	17,201	14,558	84.6
Female	16,419	13,485	82.1
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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	33,709	26,243	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	487	336	69.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	751	638	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,685	1,559	58.1
Hispanic	4,025	2,457	61.0
White, non-Hispanic	24,388	20,260	83.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,260	2,414	56.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,874	936	50.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,360	8,713	65.2
Migratory students	153	84	54.9
Male	17,230	13,253	76.9
Female	16,479	12,990	78.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	33,739	28,804	85.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	491	401	81.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	728	633	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,696	1,820	67.5
Hispanic	3,988	2,725	68.3
White, non-Hispanic	24,450	22,091	90.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,278	2,902	67.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,759	926	52.6
Economically disadvantaged students	13,368	9,933	74.3
Migratory students	145	96	66.2
Male	17,251	14,500	84.0
Female	16,488	14,304	86.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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	32,784	25,928	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	378	262	69.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	816	696	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,482	1,287	51.8
Hispanic	3,184	2,018	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	25,011	21,013	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,674	2,068	56.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	896	456	50.9
Economically disadvantaged students	10,145	6,642	65.5
Migratory students	115	80	69.6
Male	16,681	13,231	79.3
Female	16,103	12,697	78.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	32,780	27,912	85.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	384	308	80.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	774	628	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	2,488	1,692	68.0
Hispanic	3,189	2,171	68.1
White, non-Hispanic	25,032	22,360	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,702	2,459	66.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	823	327	39.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,174	7,513	73.8
Migratory students	103	66	64.1
Male	16,653	14,048	84.4
Female	16,127	13,864	86.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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	31,111	26,182	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	335	255	76.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	762	657	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2,273	1,343	59.1
Hispanic	2,994	1,965	65.6
White, non-Hispanic	23,891	21,302	89.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,229	1,967	60.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	818	367	44.9
Economically disadvantaged students	9,360	6,698	71.6
Migratory students	79	52	65.8
Male	15,766	13,563	86.0
Female	15,345	12,619	82.2
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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 the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,389	1,219	87.8
Districts	295	261	88.5
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

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 the SY 2008-09 school year. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	659	588	89.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	286	225	78.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	373	363	97.3
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group
32.

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 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
294	259	88.1
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û 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)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

[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 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	1
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 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	2
Comments:	

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.

The two schools that restructured replaced staff and also implemented "America's Choice" with the central office assuming more control over the schools.

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. 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'ts 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 2009-10 (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)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

[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 State Department of Education (KSDE) has utilized multiple strategies to improve achievement when districts are identified for improvement or corrective action.

KSDE has developed the Kansas System of School and District Support to provide technical assistance to districts and schools that are on improvement or corrective action. KSDE staff provides technical assistance to districts and schools once they are identified for improvement. This includes training on the Kansas School Improvement Process and later facilitating a peer review. Staff also provides technical assistance as schools plan for choice and SES and as they set aside 10% for professional development. Utilizing 1003a and 1003g money, districts and schools have had the opportunity to utilize school improvement resources to implement their school improvement plan. Additional technical assistance is available as requested by KSDE staff.

The Kansas Learning Network provides another support mechanism for districts and schools on improvement. The mission of the Kansas Learning Network is to continuously improve school, district, and state practices and increase student achievement through a collaborative approach that builds the capacity of teachers and administrators to improve instruction and the systems that support it. This comprehensive approach includes the following four steps:

(1) Assessing student achievement data at the state, district, and school levels to identify needs and establish strategic priorities;

(2) Gathering and analyzing perception data through surveys and focus groups to determine what practices contribute or inhibit the continuous improvement of student achievement;

(3) Providing critical technical assistance to help implement real, lasting solutions through capacity-building;

(4) Providing infrastructures and opportunities to collaborate with peers across the state in extended learning communities.

Districts participate in a district appraisal and then are provided up to 24 days of technical assistance to work on their improvement plans. Network meetings and opportunities to serve on appraisal teams allow for a collaborative approach to school improvement. Schools that are on improvement, in corrective action, or restructuring are assigned implementation coaches that provide twice monthly support on-site. The focus is on the implementation of their school improvement plans.

Districts on improvement or corrective action also have the opportunity to participate in state sponsored activities to help improve their school improvement initiatives. These include:

Root Cause Analysis: Data analysis activities help districts and schools look at the reasons they are on improvement or corrective action. School Improvement Leadership Summit: District Superintendents, Special Education Directors and School Improvement staff are brought together to understand The Kansas System of School and District Support.

Phi Delta Kappan Curriculum Assessment and Design and Delivery Training: This training program prepares educators to examine and evaluate deep alignment issues in order to improve student achievement.

What Works in Mathematics: Math Strategies for Schools on Improvement: This training focuses on the demand for mathematical literacy, how to learn math strategies, and identifies resources that increase student understanding and promote enthusiasm for learning mathematics.

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 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	8
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 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 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 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	5	5
Schools	10	4
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	9/01/09

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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 2008-09.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
    - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
    - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
    - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
    - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
    - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
    - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	9,527	8,926
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	5,730	5,167
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	60.1	57.9
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	9,476	8,940
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	6,006	4,765
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	63.4	53.3
Comments:		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	13
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	19
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.**	**Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)**	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.**
6 = Combo 1	Districts implemented combinations of strategies 1, 2, 3 and 4.	33	4	29	A	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) shares effective strategies in many ways with districts and schools on improvement, in corrective action, or in restructuring.
Each district that is on improvement is part of the Kansas Learning Network. An appraisal was done on each district by our vendor and also included other members on the appraisal team from districts on improvement, in corrective action or restructuring. This has been effective professional development for the people serving on the team. This process has also been enhanced by networking that takes place with districts. Best practices are shared and observed.
There are three networking meetings held each year as part of the Kansas Learning Network. Districts present the information from their appraisal and also share best practices.
The Kansas Learning Network established a website that schools and districts have access to that provides a forum to ask questions and share resources.
Presentations have been made at state curriculum leaders meetings and other conferences highlighting schools on improvement.

Schools that went off improvement were asked to present at the Kansas State Board of Education Meeting.

KSDE held an informative meeting before the grant writing competition to highlight best practices.

Implementation coaches are assigned to buildings and work to highlight best practices with their assigned school.

KSDE staff also visit schools on improvement, in corrective action or in restructuring.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.
1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2008-09 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) <u>evaluation</u> and <u>technical assistance</u> activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) provides evaluation and technical assistance to schools and districts on improvement, in corrective action, or schools that are restructuring.

Each district is provided a primary contact person for schools or districts on improvement or in corrective action, or schools in restructuring. A handbook was created for schools and districts on improvement, schools and districts in corrective action, and schools in restructuring. Brochures and graphics are provided to districts and schools that are on improvement or in corrective action, or schools in restructuring. A school improvement website has been developed to assist districts and schools. A monthly newsletter is published that contains information for schools and districts on improvement. KSDE staff provides a technical assistance workshop early in the school year on how to write an effective district and/or school improvement plan. The agency facilitates a peer review where districts and schools come together to review their plans before submitting them to KSDE for final review. KSDE staff uses a rubric to rate the plan and give feedback to the school and district. Agency personnel also assist districts and schools by participating in on-site visits throughout the year. A written report is filed in the district folder after each visit. Agency personnel also administer the grant program for these districts to access funds.

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

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 2008-09 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.

Kansas State Department of Education also utilized other funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 116 of ESEA.

Federal IDEA funds were used to sponsor the following events:

*The Kansas Learning Network: Partial funding for the Kansas Learning Network was taken from Federal IDEA funds. This was used to support district appraisals, network meetings, implementation coaches, and technical assistance for schools and districts.

*Multi-Tier System of Support Training: Educators are provided information in regards to meeting the reading, math, and behavioral needs of all students through a Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS)

*Highway to Literacy: This inservice addressed the needs of learners with significant cognitive impairments.

*Leadership in Literacy Workshop: This workshop focused on leadership challenges and the role leadership plays in providing quality literacy instruction for learners with disabilities.

Title I, Title II, and Reading First resources also sponsored two reading academies that were made available to schools and districts on improvement, in corrective action or schools in restructuring.

*Reading Academies: The focus of the reading academies is on how to use assessments to diagnose individual student's strengths and needs, plan instruction that matches the reading needs of the students, and use research based reading strategies during instruction with at-risk students.

*Title I Reading Academies: This academy was made available for teachers in targeted assisted buildings and in Title I schoolwide buildings.

 Title III resources supported:

*Classroom Instruction that Works with English Language Learners (Trainer of Trainer Module): Educators learn why the stages of second language acquisition are important and what their instructional implications are to build the school's/district's capacity to provide effective classroom instruction for English Language Learners.

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

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	13,543
Applied to transfer	655
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	655

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	$ 1,000,908

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.

[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	7,229
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,176
Received supplemental educational services	1,945
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

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	$ 2,944,463
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.

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	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	81,925	76,787	93.7	5,138	6.3
All elementary classes	14,367	14,005	97.5	362	2.5
All secondary classes	67,558	62,782	92.9	4,776	7.1
The method for counting elementary core academic classes was revised which led to a decline in the data when compared to last year's counts.					

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 <u>not highly qualified</u>, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided <u>at each grade level</u> are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes <u>at a particular grade</u> 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 <u>for each grade</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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	54.3
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	26.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	66.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.6
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

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 different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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).

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	3,911	3,770	96.4
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,876	3,801	98.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	16,859	15,074	89.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	21,604	20,526	95.0

1.5.4 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	63.5	32.4
Poverty metric used	Free/Reduced Lunch Status	
Secondary schools	50.0	26.1
Poverty metric used	Free/Reduced Lunch 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	
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
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.

Push-in

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	33,755
Comments: The number of ELL in this question is less than the number in the question on number tested on an English Language Proficiency test. The data comes from different databases with different business rules, programmers and time lines. We're trying to determine why there is such a difference.	

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.	26,979
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

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	27,372
Undetermined	2,140
Vietnamese	1,098
German	508
Chinese	415

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student 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 on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	34,230
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,827
Total	37,057
Comments: The number tested/not tested is higher than the number of ALL ELLs in question 1.6.2.1. The data for questions 1.6.2.1 and 1.6.3.1.1 come from different databases which reflect numbers at different times of year; different business rules and different programmers. We'll work to tighten these so they are more compatible.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	7,227
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	21.1
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) 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	26,772
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,874
Total	28,646
Comments: The number tested/not tested appears to be larger than the number of Title III ELL students. The data comes from different databases with different parameters and time periods. We're trying to determine why there is such a difference.	
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. 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 LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	6,117

1.6.3.2.2
Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States 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	15,246	52.6		20.00
ELP attainment	5,574	19.2		15.00
Comments: Kansas did not set targets for the number of ELLs making progress and attaining English proficiency. Kansas set targets using percentages. Many of the Title III participating districts have so few ELLs that establishing targets by number would be difficult to meet.				

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)
Comments: Reading assessments are only given in English.

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 funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- 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
1,177	796	1,973
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 into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
458	397	86.7	61
Comments: The state mathematics assessments are given in grades 3-8 and one grade in high school.			

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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 into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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
463	406	87.7	57
Comments: Reading assessments are given in grades 3-8 and 11.			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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
222	179	80.6	43
Comments: Science assessments are given in grades 4, 7 and 11.			

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 not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not 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	101
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	75
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	98
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	83
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	93
# -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 2007-08 and 2008-09)	6
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	9
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
Comments: For the total number of subgrantees individual districts and consortia members were included in the total count above if they indicated they wanted Title III assistance. The number implementing an improvement plan in 08-09 for not meeting AMAOs for two consecutive years was arrived at by adding the number of districts writing an improvement plan for the first time this year and the three who wrote a plan for the first time last year (there are three districts who missed AMAOs for three years).	

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 each State-set target for each 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 all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The State did not make AMAO 3. The student group of English Language Learners did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading. They did make it in mathematics.	

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 or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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
4,617	1,264	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.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

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) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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 and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	790
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 <u>additional</u> teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do <u>not</u> include the number of teachers <u>currently</u> 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 activities for 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	75	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	57	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	43	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	28	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	43	
Other (Explain in comment box)	10	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	4,037
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	51	1,260
PD provided to principals	34	312
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	32	241
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	38	649
PD provided to community based organization personnel	2	41
Total	81	6,540

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development topics include coursework for ESOL endorsement, cultural diversity, and issues relating to special education students and English Language Learners.

The total # Sugrantees under Participant Information reflects a duplicated count of districts providing professional development. Some districts provided more than one type of professional development activity.

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 intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/13/09	8/1/09	3
Comments: Letters with allocation amounts/grant awards were mailed to subgrantees on 7/16/2009. There were 3 days between the time the grant award was received from USED and the time the grant awards were mailed. The districts could then request their funds beginning with the August 1, 2009 draw down.		

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 turn around time for Kansas is fairly short. The Title III grant award from the USED is usually one of the last ESEA ones to arrive.

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	
Comments: No schools in Kansas were identified as persistently dangerous in 2008-2009.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	81.9
Hispanic	80.6
White, non-Hispanic	92.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	84.1
Limited English proficient	75.7
Economically disadvantaged	82.4
Migratory students	73.2
Male	88.3
Female	91.2
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2.5
Hispanic	2.8
White, non-Hispanic	1.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.2
Limited English proficient	2.5
Economically disadvantaged	2.1
Migratory students	2.9
Male	1.9
Female	1.5
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	288	288
LEAs with subgrants	7	7
Total	295	295
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)	91	207
K	370	313
1	328	310
2	309	270
3	288	265
4	281	259
5	251	231
6	205	213
7	189	207
8	203	222
9	279	269
10	140	244
11	132	192
12	165	267
Ungraded		
Total	3,231	3,469
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	193	687
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,796	2,529
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	47	31
Hotels/Motels	195	222
Total	3,231	3,469
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)	207
K	313
1	310
2	270
3	265
4	259
5	231
6	213
7	207
8	222
9	269
10	244
11	192
12	267
Ungraded	
Total	3,469
Comments: No districts reports homeless students as "Ungraded."	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

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	121
Migratory children/youth	11
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	506
Limited English proficient students	385
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	4
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	6
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	6
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	3
School Selection	2
Transportation	6
School records	4
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Timely enrollment is also a barrier.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served 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/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	369	265
4	369	239
5	324	204
6	283	192
7	254	166
8	267	149
High School	200	131
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State ESEA mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	372	278
4	375	249
5	323	219
6	274	171
7	257	139
8	271	117
High School	197	109
	Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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:

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.

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-ofschool youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the underlined 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 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	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	682
K	292
1	296
2	234
3	258
4	215
5	242
6	188
7	180
8	174
9	182
10	131
11	95
12	69
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	1,042
Total	4,284
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

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.

Recent years have seen many changes in the Migrant Education Program. Federal non-regulatory guidance, shifting migrant populations, the nation's economy, and the ever
changing service needs of migrant children have provided many challenges that have had an effect on Kansas' Category 1 and 2 Child Count. The following are issues that have had an adverse effect on our State's Child Counts.

       The closure of the Tyson Processing Plant in Emporia, Kansas, eliminating 2400 jobs, continues to affect our State count of children. Its effect has been felt across two counting periods. Many of these jobs were temporary in nature.
       National issues dealing with immigration continues to have an adverse effect on ID&R in our State. As our migrant recruiters make interpretations of U.S. laws regarding immigration and immigrant workers, they continue to show reluctance in working with these families. Many of these families may be Migrant and have been overlooked due to the existing climate on immigration.
       Due to the economic downturn, some producers in Kansas continue to limit their employment of seasonal and temporary agricultural workers. This continues to lead producers to lay off workers and make uncertain the employment of seasonal and temporary workers. This limits worker mobility.
       Existing economic problems and issues continue to limit worker mobility within our State, many families have settled out or moved out of State. Thus, the Kansas migrant population continues to be not as mobile as in the past.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 <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	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	59
K	66
1	98
2	72
3	77
4	62
5	76
6	32
7	50
8	37
9	46
10	25
11	16
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	723
Comments: There were no ungraded or out-of-school youth in the Category 2 Child Count.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

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.

> National and State economic issues as well as the decrease in worker mobility has had a direct affect on our category 1 and 2 child count.
> The reduction in our State's category 1 count continues to have a major impact on our summer program numbers.

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.

> The State of Kansas continues to use the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN), a state web-based migrant database developed in 2001-2002 for compiling and generating the 2008-2009 child counts.
>
> Yes, the same system was used to generate the child counts for the last reporting period.

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? 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.

> The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
>
> (a) The following data were collected and entered into the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN): the migrant student's name, parents, guardian, address, date of birth, city, state, zip code, gender, birth city, birth state, birth country, race birth verification, grade, moved to, status, enrollment date, residency date, qualifying arrival date, residency only verification date, Certificate of Eligibility (COE) number, USD#, district name, COE approval date, school building, end eligibility date, enrollment type, withdrawal date, withdrawal reason and priority for service data.
>
> (b) Migrant recruiters interviewed potential eligible migrant families. During the interview, the recruiter completed a COE. The parent signs it and is given a copy of the COE. Once a migrant program recruiter completed a Kansas Certificate of Eligibility (COE), it was submitted to the COE Approval Team for review and approval. After the COE was approved, the initial information, i.e. name and qualifying arrival date, was entered into the KMSN by staff at the COE Approval Team office. After that data was entered into the KMSN, districts were responsible for entering school history data, enrollment data, program supplemental codes, priority for service data and other pertinent educational and health data.
>
> Reports which included student totals were generated at both the SEA and LEA levels. The totals showed data by district, grade, race, age, and school building. The reports generated detected any errors and also showed when errors were corrected. Validation reports were created to diminish errors of duplication of records or ineligibility. KSDE staff reviewed the database to ensure data was being entered accurately and in a timely manner.
>
> c) Data was collected on an ongoing basis. The KMSN is available for access by the LEA's at any time. Training sessions were conducted for the LEA's to instruct them on procedures for entering data and the requirements for doing so. Initial data was collected upon recruitment and completion of the COE. LEA's continually update data to ensure enrollment data, priority for service, and all pertinent data is current.

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 and districts are required to input data into the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN). All users are provided User ID's and Passwords to access the KMSN. The KMSN menu and help files instruct them on how to navigate to the proper areas to input data in their students' records. The system saves the data to a database that generates reports and allows the district to re-access the data for updates or corrections. This system is web based and in real time so reports can be updated instantly. The data are organized through various ad hoc reports that the user can generate inputting certain parameters (e.g., dates, names, grades, enrollment types, etc.) In addition, no new child is entered into the database without the process of submission and approval by the COE Approval Team. COE's are inputted at a central location in the State.
>
> State MEP staff generate periodic reports which provide child counts for both categories 1 and 2 counts. The KMSN system is continually checked for duplication of records, data, etc.

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.

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; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reports were created using SQL server 2005 database system and using structured query language. A parameter page was written using ASP pages to generate a report. The parameter page includes areas to input birth dates of children 3 through 21 years of age, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, withdrawal reasons and qualifying arrival dates within a 48 month period. Back up reports were created using Crystal reports for regular enrollment that have grids at the end of each report that summarize the student count after listing each student individually by grade, age, district, race, and school building.

Reports were created using SQL server 2005 database system and using structured query language. A parameter page was written using ASP pages to generate a report. The parameter page includes areas to input birth dates of children 3 through 21 years of age, residency only verification dates, withdrawal dates, withdrawal reasons and qualifying arrival dates within a 48 month period. Back up reports were created using Crystal reports for residency only students that have grids at the end of each report that summarize the student count after listing each student individually by grade, age, district, race, and school building.

Reports were created using SQL server 2005 database system and using structured query language. A parameter page was written using ASP pages to generate a report. The parameter page includes areas to input the birth dates, summer enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, withdrawal reasons and qualifying arrival dates. Back up reports were created using Crystal reports for summer enrollments that have grids at the end of each report that summarize the student count after listing each student individually by grade, age, district, race, and school building.

In the structured query language, distinct was used to gather only one student ID per activity. Each child has a unique identifying number that was generated by the database when the student was entered into the system. Even if a child has two history lines in the database, only one line was counted per ID#. This was how an unduplicated count was gathered for the 12 month count period. Districts have access to all these reports. They checked their work and went back into the system to edit records as needed. KSDE staff also reviewed the database to ensure records were up to date, accurate, and not duplicated.

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.

The State of Kansas continues to operate a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) approval process in which no COE documenting new Qualifying Arrival Date's (QAD) is entered into the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN) until it has been approved by the state COE Approval Team. The State MEP has created a team of State recruiters to assist the LEAs and to ensure that all eligible migrant children are being identified and recruited within the State of Kansas. COE's written by the local migrant projects or by the State recruiting staff are signed only by recruiters who have received a minimum of 20 hours of State approved Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) training. The COE is not entered into the system until it has been reviewed and approved at the COE Approval Team.

The white and yellow copies of the COE are sent to the COE Approval Team to be reviewed, corrected if necessary and approved. If a district does not have anyone with the required hours in ID&R training, the COE is sent unsigned to a regional recruiter, who validates the COE and signs it before it's sent to the COE Approval Team for final approval. The original COE (White copy) is sent to the Kansas Migrant Education Program (MEP) Director. If a COE is not approved by the COE Approval Team, the entire COE (both the white and yellow copies) are returned to the district to be corrected and/or rewritten, otherwise the family does not qualify. Errors on COE's are noted and used in the training of recruiters.

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.

The Rolling Re-Interview procedure has been adopted to insure the integrity of the Identification & Recruitment process in the State of Kansas. A formal document including description, procedures, and sampling determinations has been written and is used extensively in the field. The goal is to re-interview families within ten days of the COE being approved by the Approval Committee in the State, thus insuring those students identified receive no migrant funded services until the secondary verification (Rolling Re-Interview) is completed.

Number of eligibility determinations sampled: 63 Number of families unable to contact after 3 attempts: 4 Number for which a test was completed: 47 Number found eligible: 47 Moved away: 12

This process is another safeguard to ensure that ineligible students are not included in the Migrant Education Program.

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.

The State of Kansas conducts training sessions each year for recruitment and data clerk staff to re-train existing employees, train new employees, and discuss significant issues. All recruiting staff is required to have at a minimum 20 training hours before signing a COE. Each year recruiting staff with 20 training hours are required to attend at least one training session to remain in good standing for recruitment. This comprehensive training helps to ensure the collection and use of accurate data. Periodic on-site visits by state staff are also conducted. The State also has, through the COE approval process, a monthly count of newly approved COE's. State MEP staff with the State's KMSN Help Desk routinely monitors the input of data. Data are examined for accuracy and completeness, as well as whether migrant projects are entering data in a timely manner.

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.

The State MEP office generated from the Kansas Migrant Student Network a Migrant Inactivity Report of students that may be eligible for the 2008-2009 counting period. LEAs reviewed the inactivity report to ensure that all migrant students were accounted for in generating the State's child count. The State conducts monitoring and T/A visits with the programs to verify that children on the database are residents in the district. This verification of migrant eligibility contributed to accurate counts of students for 2008-2009.

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 Kansas State ID&R Plan is reviewed annually and revised if necessary for continued effectiveness. The ID&R Plan continues to play a vital role in our State's ID&R efforts. The plan indicates improvements made by the State in staff development and reorganization of the state recruiting plan, as well as the minimum annual in-service needed by both local and state recruiters.

Kansas Migrant Education Identification and Recruitment Plan

The Kansas Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) plan has been in constant evolution since its inception. Due to changing federal non-regulatory guidance, shifting migrant populations, and ever-changing service needs, identification and recruitment plans must be flexible. Currently the majority of migrant recruiters in the State of Kansas are hired by local school districts or projects where migrant recruitment is only a part of their job. The primary focus of these recruiters is the mission of the district with a priority of meeting K-12 educational needs.

In the ID&R Plan, the recruiters described above are referred to as Tier I recruiters. The state currently employs close to 70 Tier I recruiters. Their scope of service is limited to the school district or the project with little or no ability to recruit outside defined boundaries, school hours, or school calendar. However, the state has a need to recruit in areas outside current projects and to address the needs of migrant children who may not currently be enrolled in school districts or other educational settings.

The ID&R Plan includes Tier II recruiters that are referred to as regional recruiters. The state has been divided into three regions covering western, eastern, and northwest parts of the state with a dissecting line separating the regions. This system requires nine regional recruiters that have a state-wide perspective with an emphasis on migrant children from birth to five years of age and those that are outside current K-12 educational settings in project areas. In non-project areas, regional recruiters recruit migrant families with children birth through 21 years of age and/or out of school youth. Regional recruiters may also assist any district if necessary.

The ID&R plan has three hiring agencies: Southwest Plains Regional Service Center in Sublette serving western Kansas, Southeast Kansas Education Service Center at Greenbush serving eastern Kansas, and Northwest Kansas Education Service Center at Oakley serving northwest Kansas. Though the regional recruiters cover three regions, all regional recruiters will be employed by one of the 3 above listed agencies. It is essential that these agencies and all recruiters ensure collaboration, coordination, and a state wide perspective.

Not only is this ID&R plan be cost effective, but it extends recruitment services throughout the summer months and fills geographic gaps currently not being addressed. A referral network has been developed between Tier I (LEA) and Tier II (regional) recruiters. For example, Tier I recruiters might refer families with children below the age of five or with older children who are not currently enrolled in educational settings while Tier II regional recruiters could refer families with school age children to local or Tier I recruiters. This referral network increases the likelihood of addressing family needs with support services outside the realm of the school district. The ID&R plan continues to advocate a state wide perspective in the supervision and staff development of Tier I and II ID&R personnel.

A Statewide ID&R Coordinator is located at the Kansas State Department of Education. The State ID&R Coordinator is responsible for the coordination of all recruitment efforts of the Tier I (LEA) and Tier II (regional) recruiters. The responsibilities of this position includes:

Directing the identification and recruitment efforts for the State of Kansas

Monitor Time & Effort activities of all recruiters.

Coordination of activities of Tier II recruiters

Identification of training/mentor needs of individual recruiters

Collaboration with the Staff Development Coordinator

Review of Qualifying Activities

Evaluation of the quality of recruiter performance, and

 Evaluation of the effective use of staff development

The plan also includes an ID&R Staff Development Coordinator responsible solely for the staff development of the entire state. The responsibilities of the ID&R Staff Development Coordinator position includes: Assist with the Fall and Spring State ID&R training sessions. Develop and provide training for all new and seasoned recruiters for the state. Implementing individual ID&R Staff Development Plans (SDP) addressing the training needs of the recruiter. Conduct one day on site visits with each recruiter to review the SDP and the progress toward meeting its objectives.

This delineation of responsibilities clearly separates the tasks of staff development and recruitment efforts.

The State ID&R Plan: a) blends local and state wide perspectives, b) provides year-round recruitment and, c) provides ID&R coverage for the entire state with a focus on all aspects of the migrant population and the support services required by the unique demands of migrant lifestyle.

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.

There are no concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported data.