

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

KANSAS



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
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	
_____ Signature	
_____ Friday, March 8, 2013, 3:29:30 PM	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2010-2011	2010-2011	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters:

Kansas adopted the Common Core Standards for Mathematics and Reading in October 2010. The expectation is that all districts and schools will be implementing these standards by 2013-2014. Kansas is in process of reviewing and possibly adopting the Next Generation Science Standards in 2013. Kansas will refer to the common core standards as "Kansas College and Career Ready Standards."

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p><u>State has revised or changed</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2015	2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2015	2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2015	2015	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below

The response is limited to 1,000 characters:

Kansas is in the process of developing the next generation of assessments which will be based on the College and Career Ready (common core standards) in reading and mathematics. These assessments will be implemented in 2014-2015. Academic achievement standards will be revised as appropriate after that implementation occurs.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Kansas will be implementing new reading/language arts and mathematics assessments based on the Kansas College and Career Ready Standards (Common Core Standards) in 2014-2015. The assessments will include grades 3-8 and high school regular assessments and alternate assessments. At that time, there will no longer be a Kansas Assessment of Modified Measures in reading or mathematics.

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 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	20.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 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)	No
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	Yes
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 (<i>IDEA</i>) 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPTION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	241,157	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,737	>=99
Asian	S	6,158	>=99
Black or African American	S	17,431	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	40,425	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	362	98
White	S	163,411	>=99
Two or more races	S	10,633	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	31,130	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	23,991	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	115,014	>=99
Migratory students	S	3,134	>=99
Male	S	123,840	>=99
Female	S	117,317	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,872	25.29
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,457	46.44
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,093	19.57
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,708	8.70
Total	31,130	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	S	241,181	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,748	>=99
Asian	S	5,984	98
Black or African American	S	17,505	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	40,145	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	360	98
White	S	163,766	>=99
Two or more races	S	10,673	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	31,276	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	23,371	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	114,979	>=99
Migratory students	S	2,975	97
Male	S	123,873	>=99
Female	S	117,308	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	308
--	-----

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

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

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

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,776	24.85
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,031	44.83
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,797	21.72
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,672	8.54
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	20	0.06
Total	31,296	////////////////////////////////////
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Per a conversation with Partner Support Center (PSC) on 03/04/2013, it was determined that there is an edit that is not working correctly within the CSPR. The C188 file is including the PARTELP students and per the Business Rule Guide this file should not. This is resulting in a difference of students in our C188 file versus our C178 of 20 students. The difference being the PARTELP students. Table 1.2.3. excludes the PARTELP and Table 1.2.4 includes them. That is why there is a difference in the totals on these two tables.</p>		

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	S	96,529	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,086	>=99
Asian	S	2,329	>=99
Black or African American	S	6,065	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	14,690	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	147	97
White	S	67,933	>=99
Two or more races	S	4,279	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	12,072	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	7,798	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	42,437	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,057	97
Male	S	49,526	>=99
Female	S	47,003	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One large district did not administer the science assessment. As a result, there is a decrease in the number of students participating in the science assessment.

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	4,886	40.47
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,379	36.27
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,711	14.17
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,096	9.08
Total	12,072	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do 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	35,269	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	S	87
Asian	964	S	91
Black or African American	2,565	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	6,502	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	61	S	92
White	23,187	S	92
Two or more races	1,641	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,849	S	76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,539	S	78
Economically disadvantaged students	18,224	S	81
Migratory students	547	S	75
Male	18,125	S	88
Female	17,144	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	35,188	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	S	86
Asian	926	S	87
Black or African American	2,565	S	65
Hispanic or Latino	6,429	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	60	S	87
White	23,211	S	89
Two or more races	1,648	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,858	S	73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,403	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	18,163	S	76
Migratory students	517	S	67
Male	18,071	S	83
Female	17,117	S	86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Kansas Science Assessments are administered in grades 4-7 and one grade in high school.

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	34,654	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	332	S	89
Asian	938	S	94
Black or African American	2,590	S	73
Hispanic or Latino	6,170	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	52	S	87
White	22,902	S	92
Two or more races	1,670	S	88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,926	S	75
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,230	S	81
Economically disadvantaged students	17,855	S	83
Migratory students	481	S	77
Male	17,788	S	89
Female	16,866	S	89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,599	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	331	S	87
Asian	917	S	91
Black or African American	2,592	S	74
Hispanic or Latino	6,105	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	51	S	>=95
White	22,930	S	92
Two or more races	1,673	S	88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,946	S	77
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,118	S	77
Economically disadvantaged students	17,799	S	83
Migratory students	456	S	75
Male	17,767	S	87
Female	16,832	S	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	33,050	S	93
American Indian or Alaska Native	323	S	92
Asian	863	S	94
Black or African American	2,008	S	78
Hispanic or Latino	5,474	S	86
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	49	S	94
White	22,684	S	96
Two or more races	1,649	S	93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,733	S	83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,603	S	83
Economically disadvantaged students	16,424	S	88
Migratory students	425	S	84
Male	16,949	S	93
Female	16,101	S	93

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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	35,016	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	373	S	85
Asian	886	S	93
Black or African American	2,492	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	6,165	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	S	86
White	23,445	S	92
Two or more races	1,611	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,733	S	71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,998	S	79
Economically disadvantaged students	17,580	S	82
Migratory students	485	S	76
Male	17,924	S	88
Female	17,092	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,986	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	374	S	83
Asian	867	S	89
Black or African American	2,490	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	6,122	S	76
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	S	80
White	23,477	S	91
Two or more races	1,612	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,741	S	71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,914	S	71
Economically disadvantaged students	17,547	S	79
Migratory students	468	S	72
Male	17,917	S	85
Female	17,069	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Kansas Science Assessments are administered in grades 4 and 7 and one grade in high school.

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	34,911	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	420	S	79
Asian	928	S	89
Black or African American	2,532	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	5,978	S	74
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	45	S	84
White	23,472	S	89
Two or more races	1,536	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,506	S	64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,702	S	70
Economically disadvantaged students	17,238	S	75
Migratory students	487	S	69
Male	18,075	S	84
Female	16,836	S	84
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,879	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	422	S	86
Asian	896	S	88
Black or African American	2,534	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	5,925	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	S	82
White	23,517	S	93
Two or more races	1,541	S	85
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,520	S	74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,596	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	17,208	S	80
Migratory students	460	S	74
Male	18,053	S	87
Female	16,826	S	89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Kansas Science Assessments are administered in grades 4 7 and one grade in high school.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,618	S	82
American Indian or Alaska Native	437	S	75
Asian	794	S	88
Black or African American	2,533	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	5,710	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	86
White	23,600	S	87
Two or more races	1,485	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,356	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,224	S	66
Economically disadvantaged students	16,311	S	72
Migratory students	485	S	64
Male	17,914	S	81
Female	16,704	S	84
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,620	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	439	S	83
Asian	772	S	88
Black or African American	2,556	S	73
Hispanic or Latino	5,660	S	80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	S	91
White	23,644	S	93
Two or more races	1,491	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,374	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,133	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	16,314	S	82
Migratory students	466	S	74
Male	17,919	S	88
Female	16,701	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	33,243	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	430	S	82
Asian	727	S	89
Black or African American	2,023	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	5,154	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	S	79
White	23,393	S	92
Two or more races	1,458	S	84
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,152	S	68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,754	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	15,078	S	78
Migratory students	431	S	71
Male	17,202	S	89
Female	16,041	S	84

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One large district did not give the science assessment; therefore there was a decrease in the number of Black or African American students who received a valid score.

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	34,329	S	82
American Indian or Alaska Native	447	S	79
Asian	850	S	89
Black or African American	2,493	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	5,610	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	S	71
White	23,426	S	88
Two or more races	1,445	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,168	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,786	S	60
Economically disadvantaged students	15,770	S	72
Migratory students	445	S	69
Male	17,602	S	81
Female	16,727	S	83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,339	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	448	S	83
Asian	831	S	87
Black or African American	2,502	S	65
Hispanic or Latino	5,580	S	74
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	57	S	74
White	23,474	S	91
Two or more races	1,447	S	85
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,187	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,727	S	62
Economically disadvantaged students	15,774	S	77
Migratory students	440	S	71
Male	17,616	S	84
Female	16,723	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Kansas Science Assessments are administered in grades 4-7 and one grade in high school.

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	32,360	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	379	S	77
Asian	798	S	86
Black or African American	2,226	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	4,290	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	43	S	84
White	23,379	S	88
Two or more races	1,245	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,592	S	62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,512	S	60
Economically disadvantaged students	12,036	S	72
Migratory students	204	S	50
Male	16,412	S	83
Female	15,948	S	83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	32,570	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	385	S	88
Asian	775	S	83
Black or African American	2,266	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	4,324	S	76
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	46	S	80
White	23,513	S	93
Two or more races	1,261	S	88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,650	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,480	S	59
Economically disadvantaged students	12,174	S	79
Migratory students	168	S	43
Male	16,530	S	88
Female	16,040	S	89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	30,236	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	333	S	84
Asian	739	S	82
Black or African American	2,034	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	4,062	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	40	S	75
White	21,856	S	91
Two or more races	1,172	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,187	S	66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,441	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	10,935	S	74
Migratory students	201	S	57
Male	15,375	S	87
Female	14,861	S	84

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,359	1,066	78.44
Districts	321	183	57.01

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were 286 public school districts in Kansas in 201-2012. The Kansas State Department of Education reported 286 districts in EDEN file 103. The additional number of "districts" include consortia of schools and state schools/districts that were reported in the EDEN file 103.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	674	493	73.15
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	370	236	63.78
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	291	257	88.32

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were 661 Title I schools in Kansas in 201-2012. It's not clear why the CSPR is showing 674 Title I schools.

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
283	181	63.96

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

In some instances, the district office took more control of decisions affecting the school. In other cases, the principals were involved more in decisions relating to staffing and budget. Some staff were replaced in a few schools.

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.

In 2008 the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) 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. Schools in restructuring complete restructuring plans and those plans are reviewed by KSDE staff and feedback is provided.

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 needs assessment process. 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 NA visit. The districts receive an in-depth report around the correlates that also includes findings and recommendations which they must address in their district integrated improvement plans.

Once the appraisal is completed, the district then begins working with their District Facilitator (an employee of Cross & Jofus, LLC) to plan their 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.

Due to funding issues there are no longer Cohort meetings 3 times a year. Communities of Practice have replaced the network meetings. During the year districts participated in a KLN Community of Practice (CoP). CoPs for district and school leaders encompassed the following areas: Curriculum and Formative Assessments (including transitioning to the Common Core); Instructional Framework, Classroom Observations, Use of Data to Improve Instruction; and, Tiered Interventions. Communities of Practice are managed by a Cross & Jofus consultant who works closely with an appropriate KSDE

director and/or consultant. CoPs enabled KLN to facilitate districts' sharing of resources and collaborative support of progress and to build on the momentum generated by current KLN participants. Beginning in January 2012, each CoP met twice a year (in two different locations for regional convenience) and held approximately four webinars featuring a participating district(s) and/or expert to promote implementation of key practices in the CoP area. Districts were also required to track and report on their own progress in implementing pre-defined practices along with formative evaluation results of the impact of those practices. Districts were encouraged to contact peers and the CoP manager via phone, email, and the KLN Basecamp for continuous support throughout the year.

There were other opportunities, such as the teacher evaluation project (KEEP) and the math focal point assessment project, that districts chose to participate in during the year.

The other major change in the 2011-12 school year, in recognition of the need to help build the capacity of the Kansas-based organization to conduct high-quality district needs appraisals and sustain the KLN process in future years, the KSDE selected 20 Kansas Learning Network Fellows to receive training in conducting needs appraisals for new districts on improvement in Cohort 5. In the 2011-2012 school year, approximately 12 districts entering improvement for the first time received a two- or three-day visit during which a team of experts and peers implemented a research-based process to identify strengths and weaknesses of the instructional delivery and support systems; determined the systemic coherence of the district; and developed the capacity of administrators and teachers to improve instruction on a continuous basis. Each Kansas Learning Network Fellow participated in two of these appraisals after receiving two days of intensive preparation and training with experienced district appraisal facilitators. In the spirit of continuous learning and improvement, the KLN was designed to be re-used by participants again and again in the hope that the process would become institutionalized within each district so that reflection, policy, and practice adjustment would occur at all levels throughout the year. There is evidence and data to support the institutionalization of the district needs assessment process through the evaluation completed by Cross & Jofus, LLP.

Districts continue to be well networked and now know each other well. 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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	12
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were 12 districts in Corrective Action status. All of them have been in this status for several years. They did not necessarily implement new curriculum in 2011-2012 but continued to implement curriculum changes that had been made in prior few years.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

//////////	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No AYP appeals were submitted in 201-2012.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
---	--

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Please refer to 1.4.5.2 for information on the KSDE's technical assistance that is provided to districts and schools on improvement, corrective action and in restructuring. In addition to this information, the KSDE facilitates the 1003(g) SIG grants. There are six schools in 5 districts in the third year of the SIG grant and one school in YR 2. These seven schools are monitored in the fall and spring by Title Programs & Services staff. This year there are two new SIG grants that were approved and are being implemented. An initial monitoring visit was held this fall with these two schools. Monitoring visits will take place in January and again in April for these two schools. Conference calls, email correspondence and phone calls are other ways the KSDE provides technical assistance to these schools. The federal monitoring desk monitoring took place the end of July. The Department of Education will be providing our agency with a final report that will address strengths and recommendations.

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

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 2011-12 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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	19,945
Applied to transfer	819
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	819
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,017,094

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	8

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:
 - o 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
 - o 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
 - o 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	6,902
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,705
Received supplemental educational services	2,183
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,440,554
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	101,755	98,425	96.73	3,330	3.27
All elementary classes	26,547	26,198	98.69	349	1.31
All secondary classes	75,208	72,227	96.04	2,981	3.96

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

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.

Elementary School Classes	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	41.40
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	48.80
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.80
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Secondary School Classes	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)	39.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	50.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	7,011	6,891	98.29
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	6,971	6,910	99.12
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	18,811	17,923	95.28
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	25,125	24,441	97.28

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	58.00	26.00
Poverty metric used	Poverty was calculated using free and reduced-price meal status.	
Secondary schools	45.00	22.00
Poverty metric used	Poverty was calculated using free and reduced-price meal status.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a) *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b) *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c) *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d) *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Newcomer Programs provide intensive, short-term English support. Push-in services us a para or ESOL endorsed teacher to provide in-class language support services.

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	47,040
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	35,082
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	38,375
Undetermined	2,438
Vietnamese	1,397
Chinese	645
German	496

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The other more common languages in Kansas are Lao (465) and Arabic (432). Kansas has begun to collect High German and Low German in order to better identify language support resources for German Mennonite populations. The language differences are available at the district level to assist in accessing interpreters. "German" above reflects High German.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	42,987
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,804
Total	45,791

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The EDEN data files that collect the data for 1.6.3 number of ELs tested and 1.6.2 EL population do not include the same business rules; therefore, the universe of students included in each file is slightly different. One includes only students enrolled during the testing window and the other includes numbers enrolled throughout the school year. Some English Language Learners are excluded from testing for emergency medical reasons. Others were classified as "nongraded." These students are included in the total ELL count but they are excluded from the testing as they are students in alternative schools who were previously counted as dropouts and who are enrolled again or are adults between 18-21.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14,221
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	33.07
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	32,478
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,811
Total	34,289
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The EDEN data files that collect the data for 1.6.3 number of ELs tested and 1.6.2 EL population do not include the same business rules; therefore, the universe of students included in each file is slightly different. One includes only students enrolled during the testing window and the other includes numbers enrolled throughout the school year. Some English Language Learners are excluded from testing for emergency medical reasons. Others were classified as "nongraded." These students are included in the total ELL count but they are excluded from the testing as they are students in alternative schools who were previously counted as dropouts and who are enrolled again or are adults between 18-21.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
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.	1,844

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	19,281	62.94	9,830	28.00
Attained proficiency	10,880	33.50	7,372	21.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Braille
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Braille
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Braille
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) 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
300	811	1,111
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
462	S	89	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
463	S	93	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
186	S	88	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	48
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	35
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	48
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	48
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	35
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	6
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	1

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Consortia members are not counted as subgrantees. Individual districts that are members of consortia are held accountable for meeting AMAOs individually, however.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting 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 <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	_____No
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas did not meet all three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Kansas met the targets for Making Progress and Attaining Proficiency. It did not Make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for English Learners in reading and math. The reading AYP target was 86%; ELs had 71.9% proficient or above. The math AYP target was 82.3%; ELs had 75.3% at proficient and above.</p>	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters</p>	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,477	568	1

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 educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	211
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	312

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
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	39	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	33	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	29	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	24	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	24	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	4	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	35	3,839
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	36	1,450
PD provided to principals	24	295
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	25	156
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	20	482
PD provided to community based organization personnel	4	80
Total	144	6,302

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Vocabulary Instruction, Sheltered Classes in content areas, Assessment Training, SIOP training, Training on Strategies, Technology usage for language acquisition and best practices using iPad/iPhone apps with/for ELL students, LEP Children of Homelessness, and Migrant children.

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/08/11	07/14/11	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.

One possibility is to email the grant award letters to the districts rather than sending my regular mail.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No schools were identified as persistently dangerous.	

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	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	276	276
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	286	286
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	123	109
K	381	592
1	386	569
2	385	478
3	373	429
4	352	416
5	318	395
6	277	386
7	265	361
8	275	315
9	227	276
10	230	235
11	195	188
12	267	234
Ungraded	7	12
Total	4,061	4,995

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	290	306
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,526	4,419
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	57	33
Hotels/Motels	188	237
Total	4,061	4,995

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 Birth Through 2	4
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	109
K	588
1	562
2	475
3	427
4	410
5	391
6	381
7	358
8	311
9	276
10	234
11	187
12	237
Ungraded	12
Total	4,962
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	206
Migratory children/youth	172
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	738
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	793
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	590	400
4	585	453
5	526	379
6	463	317
7	438	300
8	434	298
High School	263	179

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	592	432
4	599	448
5	531	380
6	470	292
7	449	249
8	436	271
High School	263	156

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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		
4	544	455
5		
6		
7	387	235
8		
High School	236	161

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	376
K	469
1	440
2	392
3	398
4	347
5	351
6	366
7	344
8	313
9	364
10	284
11	232
12	155
Ungraded	40
Out-of-school	2,908
Total	7,779
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The child count data are accurate in 1.10.1 and 1.10.2.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No increase/decrease of 10% or more exists from the FFY2011 to FFY2012 migrant child count data. The Category 1 Child Count data is correct.

In the original Consolidated State Performance Report Part I, the state math and reading assessment data showed more migrant-eligible students being assessed than were enrolled. Assessment files were re-submitted and the number of migrant-eligible students assessed does not exceed the number enrolled.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	37
K	72
1	64
2	59
3	58
4	59
5	43
6	50
7	63
8	32
9	66
10	25
11	25
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	75
Total	731
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The child count data are accurate in 1.10.1 and 1.10.2.	

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.

No increase/decrease of 10% or more exists from the FFY2011 to FFY2012 migrant child count data

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.

In January 2010, Kansas transitioned to a newly developed web-based Migrant System to collect and compile child count data reports. For 2011-2012, the Migrant System was used to generate both the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. This is the third year Kansas has used the Migrant System to generate 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.

Category 1 and Category 2 data were collected and entered into the Kansas Migrant System; 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 uploaded into the Migrant System from the KIDS database automatically as changes or additions are made by users.

The state level MEP recruiters conduct face to face interviews with potential families and enter COE data into the web-based Migrant System at the point of recruitment 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.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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.

The data for the Category 2 Count is collected in the same system as is the Category 1 Count. Summer session enrollment is June 1- August 31, 2012. Enrollment data is entered into the Migrant System by the District Level Users. All summer session data is entered into the Migrant System by September 15.

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.

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) system, each child is assigned a unique identifying number when enrolled in a Kansas district or entered into the Migrant System. The unique identifier number assigned to each student in the KIDS system is also the number used for that student in the Migrant System. There are built-in edits and checks to ensure no students are assigned duplicate numbers and no student is counted twice. Districts go through a "claiming" and "exiting" process when students enter and leave their schools. The unique identifier number remains with the student as they move from one school or district to another. When a student leaves the state, that number is not used again unless that student returns to a school in Kansas.

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.

When data are pulled for EDEN files for migrant child counts, the metadata specifically states "unduplicated" counts for Category 1 and "unduplicated" counts for Category 2. The data are then reviewed by KSDE staff to ensure it's accurate and unduplicated. Students who do not meet eligibility criteria are filtered out. The Qualifying Arrival Date plus 3 is used in pulling data for eligible students. Students outside those parameters are excluded from the counts.

The Metadata for pulling count data includes limitations on age (3-21), is eligible (Qualifying Arrival Date), summer enrollment for Category 2 counts, etc.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 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 plan included the addition of over 20 state level recruiters who are employed year round in order to recruit within the school districts as well as in areas outside of the school district and educational settings. Among the staff identified within the MEP Statewide Identification and Recruitment Plan, there is a MEP State Director, a MEP Director for Identification and Recruitment, and Monitoring/Technical Assistance and Quality Control Coordinators.

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.

A core responsibility of each State Educational Agency (SEA) under the Title 1, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP), is to ensure that only those children who are eligible for the MEP are recruited, counted and served. Prospective re-interviewing is a quality control process that provides States with valid and reliable information about the Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) process as well as identifying possible problems and how to correct them. "As part of the system of quality controls identified in Section 200.89 (d), an SEA that receives MEP funds must, on an annual basis, validate current- year child eligibility determinations through the re-interview of a randomly selected sample of children previously identified as migratory." (Federal Register/Vol. 73, No. 146/Tuesday, July 29, 2008/Rules and Regulations).

Since the previous school year required the State to conduct an independent re-interview study, this year's prospective re-interviewing was conducted by Kansas MEP rolling re-interview personnel. The Kansas Migrant Education Program conducts statewide rolling re-interviews on a monthly basis in order to assess program effectiveness, to ensure the quality of eligibility decisions and to confirm that COE eligibility determinations are accurate. In order to draw a systematic random sample for this year's study, Kansas ID&R personnel determined the sampling interval to be every 54th child, ages 3 to 21, eligible for services within the State during the year. The sampling interval was determined by dividing the number of children enrolled during 2011-12 school year (7806) by the number of re-interviews needed to be attempted (145) in order to collect 55 completed responses. The sampling universe for this re-interview process was all Kansas MEP children, ages 3 to 21, which were eligible for services in the state during the 2011-12 school year. As stated in the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing (September 2009), "a basic prospective re-interviewing approach would use a statewide random sample of 50 migrant children to check for possible errors or developing problems."

Experienced, Spanish-speaking, rolling re-interview personnel conducted the re-interviews throughout the 2011-12 school year using an over sample to account for non-response rates. In all cases, the initial sample population was exhausted for interview purposes before the over sample populations were re-interviewed. Previous re-interview studies have concluded that non-response rates are largely due to qualifying families' mobility factor since migrant families and individuals are highly mobile due to the nature of their work. In total, 55 re-interviews were conducted statewide to ensure the target number of 55 completed interviews was obtained.

All re-interviews were on-site, face-to-face interviews conducted on a systematic random sample of eligible MEP youth within the sampling universe. The instrument used to re-interview families was developed by the 1308 ConQIR Grant. The "Re-Interview Questionnaire" was field tested by eight states for accuracy. Two qualified Kansas MEP personnel

conducted the interviews. The interviewers were trained on conducting the re-interviews using the "Re-Interview Questionnaire." We assured that interviewers:

- Communicated with the families in their native language.
- Used a re-interview protocol that contained all data items used in making the original eligibility determination.
- Both interviewers had a strong background in migrant identification and recruitment.
- Used non-threatening tactics to obtain information.
- Were well trained in regards to the re-interview questionnaire.
- Were assigned geographical areas in the following manner: 100% of re-interviews were completed by a non-resident recruiter; that is, neither re-interview personnel had recruited in the area they re-interviewed.

The results of all 55 re-interviews conducted in Kansas were then reviewed by a preliminary team of three ID&R Eligibility Specialists from the State. This team reviewed the results of the re-interview data and made eligibility rulings as a result. These eligibility rulings were then given a final review by a fourth ID&R Eligibility Specialist for final approval. The goal of the Kansas Migrant Education Program's 2012 prospective re-interview study was to monitor program eligibility and to produce an eligibility discrepancy rate with a 95 percent confidence interval of +/- 5 percent. The results of the study of the 55 interviewed families and individuals concluded that all 55 were eligible for the Migrant Education Program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Kansas conducts 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 webbased 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 addition to trainings, districts and the SEA can run lists at anytime to check the data and counts.

Kansas conducts audits of Certificates of Eligibility using random samples to ensure that records and data are complete and accurate.

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.

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 ED Facts. 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.

The state director for the Migrant Education Program does not review the Certificates of Eligibility.

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.

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 made improvements to the Identification and Recruitment process as indicated in 1.10.3.4 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.

Kansas is confident in the accuracy of Category 1 Child Count data since there is a team process for reviewing and approving COEs. In addition, numerous business rules including edits are built into the data systems to ensure unduplicated counts, etc.

If districts fail to input enrollment data for summer sessions, then the Category 2 Child Count numbers may not be 100% accurate. Kansas checks to ensure that districts are entering the information in a timely manner.

Child count data was not an issue with 2011-2012 data. State assessment data, however, is an area in which there has been an issue with the numbers enrolled and the numbers assessed. That issue is being addressed.