

**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 2009-10
KANSAS**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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:

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 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 ED Facts 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part I, 2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10
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		
Thursday, April 28, 2011, 2:49:41 PM		
Signature	Date	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
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.

No revisions were made to the academic content standards in mathematics, reading of science in 2009-2010. The Kansas State Board of Education adopted the Common Core Standards at its October 2010 meeting. The initial steps for implementing the Common Core Standards are underway including helping the field understand the areas in which the Kansas reading and mathematics standards align with the Common Core Standards. New assessments will be launched in 2010.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards were taken in 2009-2010.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	17.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	83.0
Comments:	

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

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	238,923		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,157		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,145		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	17,870		>97
Hispanic	36,219		>97
White, non-Hispanic	166,031		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	30,975		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,073		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	107,903		>97
Migratory students	1,358		>97
Male	122,542		>97
Female	116,381		>97

Comments: 1.2.1 pulled data from EDEN file N081. This file excludes "Medical Emergency" students. Some of these students, who took some parts of the assessment, are included in file N093, which is used to populate 1.2.2.

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	10,753	34.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10,679	34.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,901	22.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,500	8.1
Total	30,833	

Comments: 1.2.1 pulled data from EDEN file N081. This file excludes "Medical Emergency" students. Some of these students, who took some parts of the assessment, are included in file N093, 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	239,246		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,159		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,072		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	17,946		>97
Hispanic	36,309		>97
White, non-Hispanic	166,215		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31,062		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,885		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	108,308		>97
Migratory students	1,352		>97
Male	122,697		>97
Female	116,549		>97

Comments: 1.2.3 pulled data from EDEN file N081. 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 N093, which is used to populate 1.2.4.

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,600	34.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10,137	32.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	7,703	24.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,472	8.0
Total	30,912	

Comments: 1.2.3 pulled data from EDEN file N081. 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 N093, 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	100,620		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,348		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,618		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	7,458		>97
Hispanic	14,567		>97
White, non-Hispanic	70,862		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,601		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,370		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	43,243		>97
Migratory students	531		>97
Male	51,463		>97
Female	49,157		>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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	5,962	49.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,074	25.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,073	17.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	957	7.9
Total	12,066	
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 in table 1.2.6 are 65 students less than in 1.2.5.		

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	35,000	30,722	87.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	340	82.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	924	857	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,563	1,862	72.6
Hispanic	5,981	4,899	81.9
White, non-Hispanic	23,625	21,472	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,750	3,657	77.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,043	3,234	80.0
Economically disadvantaged students	17,517	14,380	82.1
Migratory students	212	169	79.7
Male	17,941	15,801	88.1
Female	17,059	14,921	87.5
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,997	29,363	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	412	336	81.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	908	779	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,581	1,756	68.0
Hispanic	5,942	4,246	71.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,652	20,992	88.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,763	3,597	75.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,962	2,620	66.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,525	13,299	75.9
Migratory students	207	136	65.7
Male	17,939	14,893	83.0
Female	17,058	14,470	84.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,978	30,386	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	448	374	83.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	934	844	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	2,600	1,865	71.7
Hispanic	5,868	4,713	80.3
White, non-Hispanic	23,700	21,363	90.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,872	3,612	74.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,856	2,977	77.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,260	13,866	80.3
Migratory students	219	167	76.3
Male	18,052	15,743	87.2
Female	16,926	14,643	86.5

Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."

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	34,973	30,476	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	452	376	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	918	808	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,602	1,869	71.8
Hispanic	5,835	4,492	77.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,727	21,677	91.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,875	3,689	75.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,786	2,693	71.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,255	13,811	80.0
Migratory students	215	151	70.2
Male	18,064	15,599	86.4
Female	16,909	14,877	88.0

Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."

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	34,916	32,181	92.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	446	396	88.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	933	852	91.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,594	1,991	76.8
Hispanic	5,855	4,947	84.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,659	22,674	95.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,833	3,949	81.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,844	3,058	79.6
Economically disadvantaged students	17,225	15,006	87.1
Migratory students	220	178	80.9
Male	18,006	16,675	92.6
Female	16,910	15,506	91.7

Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."

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	34,515	29,860	86.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	461	358	77.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	851	772	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,658	1,877	70.6
Hispanic	5,509	4,388	79.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,592	21,263	90.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,734	3,342	70.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,402	2,563	75.3
Economically disadvantaged students	16,484	13,100	79.5
Migratory students	222	167	75.2
Male	17,888	15,518	86.8
Female	16,627	14,342	86.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,523	29,449	85.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	463	374	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	832	724	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,665	1,874	70.3
Hispanic	5,481	4,056	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,630	21,188	89.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,752	3,383	71.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,314	2,148	64.8
Economically disadvantaged students	16,500	12,760	77.3
Migratory students	213	139	65.3
Male	17,893	15,088	84.3
Female	16,630	14,361	86.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,287	28,781	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	498	381	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	905	800	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	2,647	1,673	63.2
Hispanic	5,362	3,994	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,500	20,821	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,534	3,009	66.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,001	2,057	68.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16,092	12,051	74.9
Migratory students	224	151	67.4
Male	17,567	14,719	83.8
Female	16,720	14,062	84.1

Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,308	29,805	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	502	405	80.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	890	778	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	2,659	1,845	69.4
Hispanic	5,344	4,136	77.4
White, non-Hispanic	23,534	21,459	91.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,547	3,378	74.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,946	2,028	68.8
Economically disadvantaged students	16,119	12,667	78.6
Migratory students	213	147	69.0
Male	17,578	15,068	85.7
Female	16,730	14,737	88.1

Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	33,456	26,894	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	446	331	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	864	747	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,487	1,494	60.1
Hispanic	4,977	3,321	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,343	19,958	85.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,073	2,442	60.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,473	1,443	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	14,948	10,479	70.1
Migratory students	197	130	66.0
Male	17,095	13,692	80.1
Female	16,361	13,202	80.7
Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."			

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	33,497	30,089	89.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	449	380	84.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	845	749	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,499	1,877	75.1
Hispanic	4,960	4,001	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,398	21,894	93.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,095	3,097	75.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,424	1,674	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	14,983	12,371	82.6
Migratory students	192	155	80.7
Male	17,121	15,249	89.1
Female	16,376	14,840	90.6
Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."			

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	33,372	27,999	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	444	359	80.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	867	700	80.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,481	1,455	58.6
Hispanic	4,968	3,329	67.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,278	21,080	90.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,038	2,668	66.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,464	1,297	52.6
Economically disadvantaged students	14,898	10,854	72.9
Migratory students	199	132	66.3
Male	17,049	14,667	86.0
Female	16,323	13,332	81.7

Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."

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	33,804	26,136	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	462	328	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	841	716	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	2,495	1,433	57.4
Hispanic	4,823	3,012	62.5
White, non-Hispanic	23,863	19,674	82.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,173	2,352	56.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,216	1,139	51.4
Economically disadvantaged students	14,398	9,396	65.3
Migratory students	177	97	54.8
Male	17,292	13,203	76.4
Female	16,512	12,933	78.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33,847	29,356	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	467	382	81.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	822	715	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2,514	1,776	70.6
Hispanic	4,808	3,590	74.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,911	21,765	91.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,190	2,820	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,154	1,293	60.0
Economically disadvantaged students	14,425	11,129	77.2
Migratory students	173	116	67.1
Male	17,319	14,734	85.1
Female	16,528	14,622	88.5
Comments: Due to the revised Federal reporting requirements for race and ethnicity, the way in which Race/Ethnicity is collected and reported has changed. Previously, Kansas included some Hispanic children in the Multi-Ethnic/Racial group. Now Hispanic/Latino students are only reported in the Hispanic group. This has resulted in an increase in the student group, "Hispanic."			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	32,380	26,159	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	421	300	71.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	866	750	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,352	1,319	56.1
Hispanic	3,556	2,264	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	24,104	20,676	85.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,697	2,170	58.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,056	555	52.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,910	7,348	67.4
Migratory students	110	65	59.1
Male	16,409	13,286	81.0
Female	15,971	12,873	80.6
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,456	28,362	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	404	329	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	843	697	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,360	1,689	71.6
Hispanic	3,675	2,713	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	24,085	21,996	91.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,690	2,535	68.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,012	461	45.6
Economically disadvantaged students	11,086	8,606	77.6
Migratory students	114	69	60.5
Male	16,433	14,152	86.1
Female	16,023	14,210	88.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	31,108	26,841	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	422	337	79.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	795	688	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2,207	1,400	63.4
Hispanic	3,552	2,525	71.1
White, non-Hispanic	23,171	21,081	91.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,259	2,168	66.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	976	506	51.8
Economically disadvantaged students	10,418	7,852	75.4
Migratory students	103	66	64.1
Male	15,704	13,781	87.8
Female	15,404	13,060	84.8
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,380	1,127	81.7
Districts	293	211	72.0
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 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 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	728	580	79.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	349	237	67.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	379	343	90.5
Comments: The number of Title I schools increased in 2009-2010 as a result of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Title I supplemental allocation.			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
293	211	72.0
Comments:		

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
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	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	4
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 following selections have been named as the other areas being implemented to address restructuring needs: AIMS Web; Pre/Post Course Unit Tests; District Formatives; America's Choice; Positive Behavior Supports; Screener Diagnostics; Walk-Throughs

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has developed the Kansas System of District and School Support to serve districts and schools on improvement. Every district must write a school improvement plan or a corrective action plan. KSDE staff provides technical assistance to districts and schools by training them on the process and by leading peer reviews of the plans. Other technical assistance is provided by KSDE staff when asked by the district.

The Kansas System of District and School Support also developed the Kansas Learning Network. Once a district is identified on improvement they go through an extensive appraisal. This is led by an external contractor (Cross & Jofus, LLC) and is based around the school improvement correlates: Leadership, Culture and Human Capital, Curriculum and Assessment, Instruction and Professional Development. The unique part of the appraisal is that other districts on improvement and KSDE staff also participate in the activity. The districts receive an in-depth report around the correlates that also includes findings and recommendations.

Once the appraisal is completed, the district then begins working with their District Facilitator (an employee of Cross & Jofus, LLC) to plan their 26 days of technical assistance. The District Facilitator then helps the district develop a technical assistance plan that becomes part of the District School Improvement Plan required by KSDE. KSDE has participated as part of the technical assistance on occasion on activities such as a Special Education Deep Dive Audit.

The Districts are networked with other districts in Cohorts. The first year the cohort meets three times. The teams from each district include superintendent, principal, teacher, special education director, board members, and others. KSDE staff members also attend the meetings. The first meeting is centered on the process, the second meeting is centered on presentations to each other about their appraisal results, and the third meeting is where districts present best practices to each other. The first meeting on the second year is focused around problems that each district is having and a protocol is used to have districts discuss their challenges and to receive input from others.

Districts have become well networked and now know each other well by participating in both appraisals and network meetings. An outcome of the positive experiences associated with the network includes districts sharing staff, staff development, and best practices.

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	7
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	4
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	8
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 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 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	6	3
Schools	16	6
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/13/10
---	----------

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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
 - 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 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
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 2009-10	8,489	8,426
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 2009-10	5,001	4,596
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 2009-10	58.9	54.5
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 2009-10	8,475	8,394
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 2009-10	5,431	4,950
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 2009-10	64.1	59.0
Comments:		

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	23
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	7

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	10
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 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

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 (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), 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 (strategies) (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.
5	Multi-Tier System of Supports	8	4	3	D	Curriculum & instruction alignment were supported. Core curriculum defined; additional support provided.
2		32	7	17	D	Every school received an implementation coach from another entity (Cross & Jofus, LLC) that provided coaching twice a month. Instructional practices and staff development were aligned across the school
5	America's Choice - This reform model was adopted in Middle Schools in Wichita	5	0	2	A	Reading scores improved. Instructional practices were aligned across the school
5	Literacy First Model	2	0	2	A	Reading scores improved. Instructional practices were aligned across the school
5	Evans Newton Curriculum Alignment	12	3	7	D	Curriculum alignment to state assessment and reading and math scores improving.
5	Shelter Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)	3	0	3	D	Reading and math scores for English Language Learners (ELL) improved. Instructional practices were implemented that assisted second language learners

5	Project Lead the Way	5	0	2	A	Real world learning opportunities to apply math and reading skills. Reading and math scores improved.
						Additional support for students with learning. Reading and math

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

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.

We have created the Kansas Learning Network, where we network together every school district that is on improvement or has schools on improvement. The network includes 3 network meetings a year, 26 days of technical assistance per year, a district facilitator that works with district systemic alignment, and implementation coaches that work two days a month in the buildings that are on improvement. Each district then goes through an extensive appraisal and receives a detailed report. A unique attribute of the Kansas system is that other districts that are on improvement participate in other schools appraisal process. This three day process also uses a walk-through protocol, and other district personnel actually visit the classrooms and see instructional practices. This has developed relationships among the districts and they have felt free to learn from each other and to share resources.

At the first network meeting the districts share the results of their appraisals with each other. This also includes sharing recommendations and findings. At the second network meeting a protocol is used to have districts share challenges and other participants literally have an opportunity to help the district problem solve challenges.

We also utilize a peer review process and when each building has completed their school improvement plan they meet with other schools on improvement to share plans. This is a time when clarification and revision of the plans is encouraged before submitting the final plan.

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 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kansas System of District and School Support have defined the expectations for technical assistance through the school improvement process. Kansas State Department of Education Staff on year I improvement help districts and school understand choice, write an Integrated Improvement Plan and set aside professional development funds. We also assist them with peer reviews of their plan and provide technical assistance if additional grant monies are available.

Every district that is on improvement or has schools on improvement is part of the Kansas Learning Network. The process begins with an intense three day appraisal of the district to support systemic alignment. This is done by contracted services, but also includes other districts that are in the Kansas Learning Network. There are three network meetings a year. At the first meeting they learn the process. The second meeting is when districts share their appraisals. The third meeting is when districts present their strategies they are using to improve. The first meeting the second year uses a protocol to share challenges and other districts are given an opportunity to help with the challenge. Each district has a district facilitator that helps the district develop their plan using the appraisal as a needs assessment. There are also implementation coaches assigned to each school on improvement and provide coaching to the leadership team every two weeks on implementation of the plan.

There was an evaluation conducted this year of the Kansas Learning Network. All participants were interviewed and surveyed. The findings were presented at a network meeting and a State Board of Education Meeting. Some processes were adjusted in order to make the network more effective.

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 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No funds were given.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	12,075
Applied to transfer	716
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	716
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 739,393

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
	2

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	7,105
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,101
Received supplemental educational services	2,843
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,052,922
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	78,844	75,104	95.3	3,740	4.7
All elementary classes	16,191	15,993	98.8	198	1.2
All secondary classes	62,653	59,111	94.3	3,542	5.7

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

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

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

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a

departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	55.1
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	5.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reporting through the Licensed Personnel Report (LPR) and Kansas Course Code (KCC) was changed for more accurate reporting.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	50.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	13.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	36.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reporting through the LPR and KCC was changed for more accurate reporting.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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	4,573	4,481	98.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,394	4,355	99.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	15,557	14,179	91.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	21,025	20,420	97.1
1.5.3.1 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.			

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

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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/LanguageInstructionEducationalPrograms.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
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Some districts offer a Newcomer program to provide intense, targeted English instruction for a short time to students needing additional support before entering other types of ESOL programs. Some districts use Push-in where support is provided to the EL in the classroom using a paraprofessional or a bilingual aide.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated 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	40,447
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated 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.	32,346
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	32,920
Undetermined	2,967
Vietnamese	1,278
German	570
Chinese	510

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

EDEN auto-upload includes aggregated languages as a single language. That number is reflected above as "NA". Removing that category from our data of most commonly spoken languages leaves Lao with 453 speakers as the next true single language spoken.

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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	37,570
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,215
Total	39,785
<p>Comments: The difference between EDEN files N141 LEP Enrollment(40,447) and N137 Participation Status(39,785) is 662. Those differences can be explained by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File N141 is for K-12 and Ungraded, however N137 is only for K-12. (226 children) • File N141 includes the number enrolled throughout the year; however, N137 is only looking at the number during the testing window. (521 children) <p>Note: This accounts for a 747 difference.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,680
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	28.4
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	30,625
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,513
Total	32,138
Comments: The number of students participating in Title III and the number of these students assessed with an ELP assessment varies for a several reasons: Some students were exempted from the Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment as there is no appropriate ELP alternate assessment available for students with disabilities who are ELL and qualify for alternate assessments. In addition, students who did not complete all 4 sections of the assessment are not included in the participation numbers. There are also some pre-K ELLs in the Title III schools for whom no State KELPA is available.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,191

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and 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	19,542	68.7	5,988	20.00
Attained proficiency	8,307	27.1	5,772	15.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments: The Kansas Mathematics Assessment and the Kansas Science Assessments are available in Spanish.	

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.

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.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

Language(s)

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 unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
322	1,123	1,445
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
582	494	84.9	88
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
605	525	86.8	80
Comments:			

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 out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
258	211	81.8	47
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do 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	47
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	153
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	150
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	137
# - 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 2008-09 and 2009-10)	6
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	9
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	2

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: In 2009-2010, Kansas awarded 47 Title III subgrants (allocations). Those 47 subgrants included 153 districts. Thirty-eight(38) districts participated as individual districts as each had enough English Language Learners (ELLs) to receive the minimum amount or more. The other 9 awards were for 9 different consortia which involved a total of 115 districts. The total number of districts participating in Title III was 153. Each participating district was held accountable for meeting AMAOs. The numbers provided above reflect accountability for every participating district.

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: Kansas met AMAO1 and AMAO2; however, it did not make AMAO3 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in either reading or math in 2009-2010.

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.	

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 unduplicated 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
4,180	1,330	3

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	189
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.

The number of licensed teachers working in Title III programs appears to have a significant decrease over the prior year's data. This is a result of changes in the data/reporting collection system. The License Personnel Report(LPR) collects information on teachers by assignment. Only teachers whose primary assignment is working in a language instruction educational program are included in this data. There are many licensed teachers who hold ESOL endosements whose primary assignment is a classroom such as 2nd grade.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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	87	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	72	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	55	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	39	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	49	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	73	6,261
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	55	948
PD provided to principals	40	325
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	33	196
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	36	595
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	71
Total	242	8,396

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of subgrantees includes every district that is either receiving an individual district Title III allocation or is a participating member of a consortia grant.

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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/23/09	08/1/09	8
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The grant award notification from the US Department of Education was dated July 2; however, it was July 23, 2009 before it reached the Kansas State Department of Education. The Kansas State Department of Education staff has all the ELL counts ready and knows which districts intend to participate via consortium. The KSDE is ready to run the allocations as soon as the grant award is received. It would enhance the process if the State Title III Director was sent the grant award electronically from the US Department of Education.

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 Kansas schools were identified as persistently dangerous.	

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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	82.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	85.0
Hispanic	81.0
White, non-Hispanic	91.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	85.3
Limited English proficient	77.5
Economically disadvantaged	81.8
Migratory students	81.9
Male	88.2
Female	91.0
Comments:	

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.

The above graduation rate data was calculated using an approved transitional formula. The Kansas State Department of Education is writing the business rules and definitions in order to begin using the 4-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate. Districts and schools will be reviewing their 2010 graduation data based on the new formula later this year. The 2006-2007 first-time 9th graders is the first cohort for which the 4-year adjusted cohort rate will be calculated. The adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations made based on 2010-2011 assessments will include the new graduation rates. The KSDE anticipates submitting its final definition and rules to USED for Peer Review during the 2010-2011 school year.

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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	<3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	<3
Hispanic	<3
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	<3
Limited English proficient	<3
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	<3
Male	<3
Female	<3
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	269	269
LEAs with subgrants	24	24
Total	293	293
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)	80
K	191	762
1	175	668
2	153	607
3	147	521
4	143	549
5	133	516
6	136	475
7	84	424
8	116	397
9	110	482
10	95	358
11	108	271
12	148	334
Ungraded	11	N<10
Total	1,830	6,622

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	87	559
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,655	5,542
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	42	48
Hotels/Motels	46	473
Total	1,830	6,622

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)	250
K	762
1	668
2	607
3	521
4	549
5	516
6	475
7	424
8	397
9	482
10	358
11	271
12	334
Ungraded	N<10
Total	6,622
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	208
Migratory children/youth	187
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,054
Limited English proficient students	1,018
Comments:	

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	13
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
Transportation	15
Early childhood programs	11
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	15
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	18
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

n/a

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	4
Transportation	7
School records	3
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

n/a

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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	478	318
4	477	345
5	447	311
6	423	282
7	365	264
8	361	233
High School	260	179
Comments:		

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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	479	346
4	478	341
5	445	306
6	419	269
7	361	198
8	366	188
High School	260	156
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	486
K	376
1	402
2	377
3	332
4	328
5	337
6	308
7	258
8	257
9	295
10	231
11	150
12	129
Ungraded	305
Out-of-school	2,579
Total	7,150
Comments:	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.1

From FY2009 to FY2010, Kansas had an increase of eligible migrant children. Kansas attributes this increase to the following factors;

- Improved data accuracy and accountability has been achieved through the implementation of a new web-based Migrant System that electronically tracks COE approvals and statuses, PFS, and other student information by a unique student state ID number. The Migrant System also interfaces with the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) data collection system to ensure an unduplicated count of children. Since state level staff can now monitor the COE approval process electronically, the amount of time it takes for students to be identified has been reduced.
- Kansas has implemented a new Migrant Education Program Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan that has increased child find activities. This new plan includes the addition of over 20 state recruiters who are employed year round in order to recruit in areas outside of the school district and educational settings.
- The Kansas economy began a slow rebound during the 2009-2010 year as evidenced by data reported on the Bureau of Labor Statistics (www.bls.gov). In August 2010, the Kansas unemployment rate was 6.5%, which is a decrease of .7% from the August 2009 unemployment rate of 7.2%.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	39
1	47
2	48
3	45
4	35
5	39
6	27
7	25
8	14
9	24
10	30
11	11
12	
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	42
Total	446
Comments: The summer/intersession count for grade 12 is 0.	

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.

1.10.2

From FY2009 to the FY2010, Kansas had a decrease of eligible migrant children in the Category 2 child count.

Due to fiscal constraints that occurred during the 2009-2010 school year, many districts reduced or eliminated summer programs. In addition, larger districts applied for and used migrant funds to provide services in the summer of 2009, while smaller districts applied for and used migrant funds to provide services in the summer of 2010.

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.

1.10.3.1

In January 2010, Kansas designed in-house and deployed a new web-based Migrant System to collect and compile CSPR child count data and reports. The Migrant System is used to enter Certificates of Eligibility (COE), enrollment, priority for services, courses, and services/referrals information for migrant-eligible children in Kansas. All data within the old web-based application was migrated prior to the deployment of the new Migrant System. Therefore, the same system generated the Category 1 and Category 2 child count data for 2009-2010 EDEN reports. In order to ensure valid and reliable child count and data queries, the Migrant System underwent a lengthy testing process by the KSDE Information and Technology staff.

Category 1 and Category 2 data collected and entered into the new Kansas Migrant System include; the migrant student's name, parents, guardian, address, date of birth, city, state, zip code, gender, birth city, birth state, birth country, birth verification, moved to status, student state identification number, 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. In addition, LEP and disability status, enrollment data, and race/ethnicity data, grade level, and other required data were cross walked into the Migrant System from the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) database, which assigns a unique identifying number to each child enrolled in a Kansas district.

Within the Migrant System, numerous data quality controls are integrated throughout the data collection and reporting process. A Migrant System User Guide, which includes definitions and parameters for each data field, is available within the Migrant System as data is entered into the system. Automated verification checks are also embedded within the Migrant System so data anomalies can be verified at the point of entry. As data is compiled to generate the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts, it is verified using a series of quality control measures. All data is reviewed by the IT programmer, the KSDE Title Programs and Services Team data stewards, and KSDE leadership to ensure validity and reliability prior to the CSPR submission.

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.

1.10.3.2

Category 1 and Category 2 data collected and entered into the new Kansas Migrant System include: the migrant student's name, parents, guardian, address, date of birth, city, state, zip code, gender, birth city, birth state, birth country, birth verification, moved to status, student state identification number, residency date, qualifying arrival date, residency only verification date, Certificate of Eligibility (COE) number, USD#, district name, COE approval date, school building, and end eligibility date. In addition, LEP and disability status, enrollment data, and race/ethnicity data, grade level, and other required data were uploaded into the Migrant System from the KIDS database automatically as changes or additions are made by users.

The state level MEP recruiters interview potential families and enter COE data into the web-based Migrant System per the Migrant System User Guide specifications. Once the COE is submitted electronically, the Kansas state level COE Team individually verifies the accuracy of all COE data to ensure that appropriate eligibility is determined. After the COE has undergone three reviews, a final review is conducted prior to the final state approval of the COE. All procedures of the COE review process are tracked by date within the web-based Migrant

System. District level users are responsible for entering priority for service data, enrollment and exit data. As data is entered into the Migrant System, automated verification checks require the user to correct data anomalies prior to saving COE data.

As part of this EDEN data submission, reports which include student totals are generated at both the SEA and LEA levels. Student child counts are reported by district, grade, race/ethnicity, LEP status, disability status, PFS, and QAD. Data for these EDEN files is collected on an ongoing basis with the Migrant System which is available for access by the LEAs at any time during the year. Training sessions are conducted for application users regarding the requirements and procedures for entering data. Data is continually updated to ensure enrollment data, priority for service, and other pertinent data is current.

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

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.

1.10.3.2(2)

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

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.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.3

KSDE utilizes an agency-wide data governance structure which includes a data steward team approach to ensure all data reported to the USDE is timely and accurate. The data steward team meets monthly to discuss upcoming data reports and requirements. Both the Migrant program staff and the EDEN data coordinator are members of this team. As a result, numerous improvements continue to be made to data processes and procedures.

For both the EDEN File 121 and EDEN File 122 (migrant child counts) reports were created using a SQL server database system and structured query language. These stored procedures are reviewed and updated each year to align with EDEN file specifications and saved within the Migrant System programming to generate consistent reports over time.

Within the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) database, each child is assigned a unique identifying number when enrolled in a Kansas district or entered into the Migrant System. In addition, SQL procedures aligned with the EDEN file specifications are stored within the Migrant System to ensure an accurate child count for the Category 1 and Category 2 reports. If a child has two history lines in the KIDS database for the same time period, only one line is counted per ID#. KSDE staff also query the Migrant database to ensure records are up to date, accurate, and unduplicated. Districts have the ability to create reports and export student data into Excel as a means to verify data and make corrections within the Migrant System if necessary.

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.

1.10.3.3(1)

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4

The Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is initially entered into the Migrant System by the state level recruiters. Until it is verified and approved, no COE data is moved into the child count component of the Migrant System.

During the review process, the COE information, if necessary, is sent back to the state level recruiter to correct data anomalies and resubmit. Data regarding COE anomalies are tracked within the Migrant System and are used in the training of state level recruiters. It should be noted that Kansas uses the National Certificate of Eligibility form.

During 2009-2010, Kansas implemented a new MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan that has increased child find activities. This new plan includes the addition of over 20 state level recruiters who are employed year round in order to recruit within the school districts as well as in areas outside of the school district and educational settings. Among the staff identified within the MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan, there is a MEP State Director, a MEP Director for Identification and Recruitment, and Monitoring/Technical Assistance and Quality Control Coordinators.

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

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.

1.10.3.4(1)

During 2009-2010, Kansas implemented a new MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan that has increased child find activities. This new plan includes the addition of over 20 state level recruiters who are employed year round in order to recruit within the school districts as well as in areas outside of the school district and educational settings. Among the staff identified within the MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan, there is a MEP State Director, a MEP Director for Identification and Recruitment, and Monitoring/Technical Assistance and Quality Control Coordinators. The new statewide recruiting system is designed to include year-round recruitment, provide ID&R coverage for the entire state, and ensure all eligible MEP children are identified and recruited in Kansas.

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

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 60 days of the COE being approved by the state level COE Approval Team thus ensuring those students identified receive no migrant funded services until secondary verification (Rolling Re-Interview) is completed. 2009-2010 Rolling Re-Interview procedure produced the following results:

Number of eligibility determinations sampled: 107

Number of families unable to contact after 3 attempts: 4

Moved away: 13

Number for which a test was completed: 90

Number found eligible: 90

Number found ineligible: 0

Accuracy: 100%

The above evaluation data from the most recent Kansas Rolling Re-Interview process indicate 100% accuracy in appropriate identification of eligible Migrant children which substantiates the effectiveness of the Kansas state level recruitment efforts. This process is another safeguard the State of Kansas has implemented to ensure that ineligible students are not included in the Migrant Education Program Category 1 and 2 child counts.

To further ensure data accuracy, the State of Kansas conducts ongoing training sessions for the state level recruiters and district data clerks to re-train existing employees, train new employees, and discuss significant issues. Multiple training sessions are held for district data clerks. This professional development is provided through face to face meetings as well as web-based training modules designed to target specific data entry procedure. The Kansas Identification and Recruitment Manual is also available online at: <http://ks-dr.org/resources/references/manual/index.html>

The Identification and Recruitment Director is responsible for providing direct supervision of all ID&R regional offices in Kansas and keeping the State MEP Director informed of all activities such as; developing strategies and timelines for meeting the seasonal and temporary flow of migrant work in the state, and developing a timely notification system to existing projects for students that have been identified in their districts and/or regions. The ID&R Director is also responsible for overseeing the professional development and evaluation of all Kansas state MEP recruiters.

Monthly and quarterly trainings are conducted with state level recruiting staff responsible for identifying and entering COE data. Training information is sent out via a Migrant Listserv and posted on the www.ksmigrant.org website along with all ID& R forms at http://www.ks-idr.org/forms_logs.html . Since the new Migrant System tracks the COE process electronically, state level monitoring to identify patterns and concerns of recruitment data entry is ongoing, and technical assistance can be targeted and corrected at the individual recruiter level. All migrant data are monitored at the state level for accuracy and completeness, as well as whether migrant projects are entering data in a timely manner.

KSDE has developed a Data Quality Certification (DQC) program with specialized tracks for data entry personnel, data coordinators, program staff, and administrators. These tracks include instruction on general data quality practices and techniques, as well as intensive role-based training with the KSDE web-based applications, including the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) system, and their support resources. A track for the Migrant System and Migrant data collection procedures has been developed and integrated within the DQC program.

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.

1.10.3.4(2)

The State of Kansas conducts ongoing training sessions for recruitment and data clerk staff to re-train existing employees, train new employees, and discuss significant issues. Multiple training sessions are held for district data clerks. This professional development is provided through face to face meetings as well as web-based training modules designed to target specific data entry procedures.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) has developed a Data Quality Certification (DQC) program with specialized tracks for data entry personnel, data coordinators, program staff, and administrators. These tracks include instruction on general data quality practices and techniques, as well as intensive role-based training with the KSDE web-based applications, including the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) system, and their support resources. A track for the Migrant System and Migrant data collection procedures has been developed and integrated within the DQC program.

Monthly and quarterly trainings are conducted with state recruiting staff responsible for entering COE data. Since the new Migrant System tracks the COE process electronically, state level review to identify patterns and concerns of data entry errors is ongoing, and technical assistance can be targeted and corrected at the individual recruiter level.

All migrant data are examined at the state level for accuracy and completeness, as well as whether migrant projects are entering data in a timely manner.

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.

1.10.3.4(3)

EDEN file specifications along with initial data compiled for the EDEN File 121 and 122 files (child counts) are reviewed by multiple team members and revised if necessary prior to submission to EDFacts. KSDE utilizes an agency wide data steward team approach to ensure all data reported to the ED is timely and accurate. The data steward team meets monthly to discuss upcoming data reports and requirements. Both the Migrant program staff and the EDEN data coordinator are members of the data steward team. As a result, numerous improvements continue to be made to data processes and procedures.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4(4)

As indicated in 1.10.3.4(1), the most current Rolling Re-Interview procedure resulted in 0 corrective actions. Therefore, no concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported data exist.

During 2009-2010, Kansas has made improvements to the Identification and Recruitment process as indicated in 1.10.3.4(4) through the

implementation of a MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan utilizing over 20 state recruiters employed year round. The new statewide recruiting system is designed to include year-round recruitment, provide ID&R coverage for the entire state, and ensure all eligible MEP children are identified and recruited in Kansas.

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.

1.10.3.4(5)

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