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 2012-13

KANSAS

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

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) 2012-13 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 learnin
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high schoo

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 mor 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2012-13 ___Part II, 2012-13

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

Address:
900 SW Jackson St
Topeka, KS 66612

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Melissa Tillman

Telephone: 785-296-1103

Fax: 785-296-7933

e-mail: mtillman@ksde.org

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Melissa Tillman

_____ Thursday, March 6, 2014, 5:48:13 PM
Signature

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2012-13

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.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2012-2013

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content 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 continue the implementation of these standards.

Kansas has reviewed and adopted the Next Generation Science Standards as of June 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.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014	2014	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014	2014	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 a transitional assessment for the College and Career Ready (Common Core Standards) in Reading and Mathematics, which will be administered in 2013-14. The 2013-14 transitional assessment, developed by the Center for Educational Testing (CETE) at the University of Kansas, will be further enhanced and used in place of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) in 2014-15. This CETE developed assessment will be designed according to the SBAC blueprint. Achievement Standards will be revised in 2013-14, and again in 2014-15.

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.*

Response	Options
No Revisions or changes	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., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2013-2014	2013-2014	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2013-2014	2013-2014	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 began implementing new Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics assessments based on the Kansas College and Career Ready Standards (Common Core Standards) in 2013-14. The assessments include grades 3-8 and High School regular assessments. An alternate assessment will be implemented in 2014-15. At this time, there is no longer 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 2012-13, 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)	41.00
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	59.00
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 2012-13 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	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	241,988	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,980	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	6,787	98.1
Asian	S	6,410	98.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	377	97
Black or African American	S	17,129	98.1
Hispanic or Latino	S	40,120	98.5
White	S	163,685	99.4
Two or more races	S	11,287	99.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	31,414	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	25,573	98.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	117,527	98.7
Migratory students	S	1,547	94
Male	S	124,367	99.0
Female	S	117,621	99.2

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,682	27.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,067	44.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,970	19.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,695	9
Total	31,414	///
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	242,342	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,019	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	6,678	97.4
Asian	S	6,299	97.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	379	96
Black or African American	S	17,220	98.1
Hispanic or Latino	S	40,027	98.3
White	S	164,039	99.3
Two or more races	S	11,359	99.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	31,532	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	25,286	97.3
Economically disadvantaged students	S	117,855	98.7
Migratory students	S	1,505	93
Male	S	124,526	98.9
Female	S	117,816	99.1

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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

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 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	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	904

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,656	27.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,435	42.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,732	21.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,661	8
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	48	≤10
Total	31,532	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	100,969	98.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,267	98
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	2,917	96.8
Asian	S	2,752	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	165	96
Black or African American	S	7,103	96.3
Hispanic or Latino	S	16,160	97.0
White	S	69,073	98.6
Two or more races	S	4,449	98.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	12,532	95.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	9,758	96.2
Economically disadvantaged students	S	46,603	97.3
Migratory students	S	608	93
Male	S	51,851	98.0
Female	S	49,118	98.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	5,097	40.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,475	35.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,919	15
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,041	8
Total	12,532	

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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for academic achievement data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months unless a state chooses to include these students. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students 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	35,038	S	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	364	S	75
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,039	S	86
Asian	984	S	87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	65
Black or African American	2,423	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	6,407	S	69.8
White	23,017	S	85.9
Two or more races	1,788	S	78
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,834	S	64.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,589	S	66.7
Economically disadvantaged students	18,513	S	71.9
Migratory students	256	S	59
Male	18,019	S	81.1
Female	17,019	S	80.1

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,844	S	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	365	S	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	973	S	83
Asian	920	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	53	S	68
Black or African American	2,414	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	6,287	S	67.1
White	23,018	S	86.6
Two or more races	1,787	S	79
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,833	S	67.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,343	S	61.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18,349	S	71.1
Migratory students	214	S	59
Male	17,921	S	80.0
Female	16,923	S	81.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
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	35,144	S	82.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	381	S	81
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,017	S	89
Asian	954	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	S	87
Black or African American	2,552	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	6,286	S	70.8
White	23,220	S	87.5
Two or more races	1,688	S	79
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,976	S	66.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,422	S	67.0
Economically disadvantaged students	18,112	S	73.8
Migratory students	253	S	59
Male	18,082	S	82.3
Female	17,062	S	82.4

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	34,990	S	85.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	378	S	88
Asian or Pacific Islander	958	S	89
Asian	899	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	≥90
Black or African American	2,550	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	6,180	S	74
White	23,227	S	90.8
Two or more races	1,697	S	84
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,978	S	73.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,207	S	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	18,003	S	78.1
Migratory students	222	S	63
Male	18,005	S	84.2
Female	16,985	S	87.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	35,071	S	91.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	382	S	93
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,013	S	90
Asian	950	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	S	89
Black or African American	2,540	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	6,272	S	81.4
White	23,180	S	95.6
Two or more races	1,684	S	89
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,959	S	79.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,420	S	76.7
Economically disadvantaged students	18,058	S	85.2
Migratory students	255	S	71
Male	18,041	S	91.2
Female	17,030	S	90.9

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,542	S	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	388	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	979	S	88
Asian	924	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	80
Black or African American	2,555	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	5,902	S	71.3
White	22,971	S	85.7
Two or more races	1,747	S	81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,858	S	62.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,146	S	67.9
Economically disadvantaged students	17,788	S	72.4
Migratory students	226	S	64
Male	17,701	S	81.1
Female	16,841	S	81.1

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	34,430	S	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	387	S	80
Asian or Pacific Islander	949	S	87
Asian	896	S	88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	53	S	85
Black or African American	2,560	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	5,800	S	73.3
White	22,980	S	89.3
Two or more races	1,754	S	85
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,869	S	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,965	S	67.7
Economically disadvantaged students	17,700	S	76.5
Migratory students	196	S	62
Male	17,645	S	82.9
Female	16,785	S	86.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
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.			

1.3.1.4 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	34,996	S	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	477	S	67
Asian or Pacific Islander	917	S	86
Asian	878	S	87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39	S	64
Black or African American	2,441	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	5,923	S	63.8
White	23,568	S	82.5
Two or more races	1,670	S	72
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,538	S	53.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,813	S	59.7
Economically disadvantaged students	17,413	S	65.3
Migratory students	241	S	60
Male	17,973	S	76.3
Female	17,023	S	76.9

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	34,887	S	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	S	83
Asian or Pacific Islander	885	S	89
Asian	848	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	84
Black or African American	2,445	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	5,819	S	75.2
White	23,590	S	90.7
Two or more races	1,670	S	86
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,548	S	68.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,637	S	69.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,337	S	77.8
Migratory students	217	S	71
Male	17,905	S	84.4
Female	16,982	S	87.8

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
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	35,136	S	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	S	64
Asian or Pacific Islander	993	S	83
Asian	944	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	49	S	73
Black or African American	2,507	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	5,769	S	59.5
White	23,826	S	80.1
Two or more races	1,563	S	72
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,415	S	48.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,639	S	54.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,062	S	62.4
Migratory students	246	S	44
Male	18,211	S	73.0
Female	16,925	S	75.9

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	35,057	S	87.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	S	83
Asian or Pacific Islander	941	S	89
Asian	894	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	47	S	77
Black or African American	2,512	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	5,703	S	77.7
White	23,856	S	91.5
Two or more races	1,567	S	86
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,413	S	68.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,484	S	71.2
Economically disadvantaged students	16,995	S	79.2
Migratory students	216	S	65
Male	18,170	S	85.2
Female	16,887	S	89.4

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	35,070	S	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	473	S	78
Asian or Pacific Islander	989	S	82
Asian	940	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	49	S	76
Black or African American	2,500	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	5,743	S	67.5
White	23,802	S	89.8
Two or more races	1,563	S	81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,388	S	64.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,618	S	59.8
Economically disadvantaged students	17,001	S	72.7
Migratory students	245	S	54
Male	18,167	S	85.1
Female	16,903	S	80.9

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	34,458	S	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	455	S	66
Asian or Pacific Islander	866	S	80
Asian	803	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	63	S	68
Black or African American	2,466	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	5,422	S	60.2
White	23,683	S	82.0
Two or more races	1,566	S	71
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,253	S	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,133	S	50.8
Economically disadvantaged students	16,075	S	62.9
Migratory students	223	S	46
Male	17,826	S	74.6
Female	16,632	S	76.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

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	34,396	S	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	448	S	79
Asian or Pacific Islander	834	S	84
Asian	772	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	62	S	81
Black or African American	2,482	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	5,352	S	71.5
White	23,706	S	90.0
Two or more races	1,574	S	82
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,273	S	62.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,989	S	61
Economically disadvantaged students	16,028	S	74.5
Migratory students	197	S	57
Male	17,786	S	82.7
Female	16,610	S	86.4

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
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	32,674	S	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	437	S	68
Asian or Pacific Islander	976	S	82
Asian	923	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	53	S	68
Black or African American	2,185	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	4,411	S	63.1
White	23,400	S	84.9
Two or more races	1,265	S	75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,540	S	55.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,831	S	48
Economically disadvantaged students	12,564	S	66.1
Migratory students	102	S	20
Male	16,555	S	79.1
Female	16,119	S	79.1

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

The IDEA and Native Hawaiian data were verified as accurate.

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	32,834	S	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	476	S	82
Asian or Pacific Islander	935	S	84
Asian	876	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	85
Black or African American	2,212	S	66
Hispanic or Latino	4,361	S	73.9
White	23,551	S	91.5
Two or more races	1,299	S	86
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,570	S	68.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,757	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	12,698	S	76.9
Migratory students	87	S	37
Male	16,624	S	85.9
Female	16,210	S	87.9

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

The Native Hawaiian data were verified as accurate.

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	30,828	S	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	412	S	82
Asian or Pacific Islander	915	S	82
Asian	862	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	53	S	87
Black or African American	2,063	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	4,145	S	70.6
White	22,091	S	91.0
Two or more races	1,202	S	84
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,185	S	65.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,720	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	11,544	S	73.8
Migratory students	108	S	44
Male	15,643	S	86.7
Female	15,185	S	83.6

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Migrant data have been verified as accurate. A change was made within the Kansas system for school year 2012-13 to correct a data issue regarding the number of Migrant students assessed versus the number of Migrant-eligible students. It was discovered, based on the 2011-12 data, that there were more Migrant students assessed than were eligible based on the way Kansas was flagging the Migrant status. In the assessment files, if a student had been identified as Migrant at any time while in the Kansas school system, they were marked as Migrant during the assessment period. This was an error that did not take into consideration the window of eligibility for the students. This has been corrected, and it has been verified that the number of Migrant students assessed in 2012-13 were eligible during a portion of the 2012-13 school year. This change did result in a significant decrease in the assessed Migrant population, but that was expected difference from the previous year's data. Kansas worked with the OME team at ED to address these issues, and reported back when each of three milestones was met.

The IDEA data were verified as accurate.

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas received an ESEA Flexibility Waiver and utilized the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools.			

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [3] based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	1,325	82	6.19
Districts	286	2	0.70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

[3] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. 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 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas received an ESEA Flexibility Waiver and utilized the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools.			

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator [4] based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	650	32	4.92
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	390	9	2.31
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	260	23	8.85
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

[4] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas received an ESEA Flexibility Waiver and utilized the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools.		

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [5] based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
286	2	0.70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

[5] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, 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. Corrective Action was not done in Kansas for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.	

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Restructuring was not done in Kansas for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5.2 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.

!starting in the 2012-2013 reporting period, Kansas no longer identifies Districts on Improvement or Corrective Action.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Corrective Action was not done in Kansas for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.	

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 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas did not calculate AYP for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, and there is no longer an appeal process.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) SchoolImprovement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Tille I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) SchoolImprovement Funds.

1A.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enler the percentage oflhe FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) Tille I, Part A allocalion lhallhe SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation offunds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA:* 4.00 %

!comments: The response is limited lo 4,000 characters.

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

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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 2012-13.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Technical Assistance:

KSDE uses a comprehensive approach when selecting, guiding and providing technical assistance. To support the implementation of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver in Priority/SIG schools, the SEA provides technical assistance to the LEAs using the following methods:
• Special Events - KLN (Kansas Learning Network) Kick-Off, District Needs Assessment Visits, Webinars
• Contracted Supports - Implementation Coaches, District Facilitators, Network Service Providers
• KSDE Supports - School Improvement Coordinator, Kansas Integrated Innovations Teams, KSDE Technical Assistance System Network, Multi-Tier System of Supports
• Publications - Various Fact Sheets, Indicator Crosswalk, District Initiative Crosswalk, Menu of Meaningful Interventions
• KansaStar - Indicators of Effective Practice, Coaching Logs, Coaching Comments, Kansas Integrated Innovation Team (KIIT) Feedback, Meeting Minutes and Agendas, Indicators in Action and Indicator Now

Much of the technical assistance that has been provided has been implemented in the schools across Kansas. In the previous year, all nineteen districts that we served were provided a District Facilitator that worked with both the district and school to assist in implementing interventions from the District Needs Assessment. Priority schools have had both a District Facilitator (DF) and Implementation Coach (IC). The Implementation Coach works directly with the Priority schools to ensure implementation of the Turnaround Principles. In the 2013-2014 school year, all Focus and Priority schools will be assisted by an Implementation Coach to ensure that technical assistance is reaching the schools and teachers in Kansas.

Several methods have been used to determine that appropriate technical assistance is reaching Priority schools with the need. Attendance is tracked at webinars and trainings. When a school has missed a training event, providers return to the district to provide a second opportunity and ensure that all schools are receiving adequate assistance. KansaStar is also used to identify where additional training may be needed for individual Priority and SIG schools. Reaching out to district personnel has helped us determine if the technical assistance is reaching those that most need it and its effectiveness. Technical assistance and resources are provided to assist schools to implement and sustain evidence-based practices that have a positive impact on student learning.

Initially, the LEAs with Priority and SIG schools were in need of an assessment that would identify the areas of strength and weakness in each district and their schools. The District Needs Assessment visit and report process was effective in addressing this need. From the District Needs Assessment, School Action Plans were written and implemented in order to improve practices around the Turnaround Principles.

The support of the Implementation Coaches has been critical to ensuring effective technical assistance. Satisfaction survey results and other means of feedback indicate that Implementation Coaches have had a positive impact in Priority schools. In the 33 Priority schools only one Implementation Coach was not invited back. One testament of the effectiveness of the Implementation Coaches involves three new SIG grants this year. All three SIG schools wrote the Priority school Implementation Coach into the school improvement grants application.

Many of the publications produced were done in direct response to a request from the field. Others have been written in anticipation of needed assistance. All members included in the KSDE supports (listed above) work together to provide technical assistance that meets the specific needs of Priority and Focus Schools.

An area of technical assistance in need of refinement was the school improvement online management tool, KansaStar. With the help of the field, several areas of improvement were identified. Initially, KSDE may not have provided enough training at all levels when beginning use of KansaStar. Feedback from multiple sources indicated districts understanding and perception of the purpose of KansaStar varied widely. As a result, additional training with ICs and DFs has commenced and additional training has been scheduled with district office personnel and building leadership teams in September. Our message will be that KansaStar indicators are not "initiatives," they are indicators of effective practices that will support initiatives and interventions found in the KLN needs assessment, district plans and building plans.

Ongoing training for ICs and DFs, district and school personnel, as well as KSDE supporting staff, is planned for the current school year. A continuous flow of information and feedback is necessary to maintain the forward movement that is currently underway in our Priority and Focus schools.

As budgets reductions occur, it becomes more challenging to maintain a consistent level of services and supports established in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Evaluation and Monitoring:

As the 2012-2013 year progressed numerous types of data were collected. One important element of KansaStar is its ability to provide KSDE with a variety of data reports around the progress of the work around effective practice indicators. These reports can be accessed by the schools, districts and State Department of Education.

Cross & Joftus, a former partner in the Kansas Learning Network, has been collecting state assessment data of schools and districts on improvement for the previous four years. 2012 assessments gave them their fifth year of data. KSDE received the latest report in May of 2013. Cross & Joftus also conducted a satisfaction survey of Focus and Priority school implementation coaches, district facilitators, principals and superintendents.

The School Improvement Coordinator, in an effort to collect additional data, contacted the 19 superintendents in the Kansas Learning Network to review a series of focused questions. An opportunity for open conversations about strengths and weaknesses of the school improvement process was encouraged.

During the final training of the KLN Implementation Coaches and District Facilitators a survey was conducted to allow those working directly with building leadership teams to express what they believed to be the strengths and weaknesses of the first year of implementation around Priority and Focus schools.

As a result of the data and feedback opportunities, the KSDE made revisions to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver and the work of the KLN.

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 stale in SY 2012-13 thaiwere 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.

!There are no other funds thaiare used lo support Priority, SIG, and Focus schools.

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 Title I school 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	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas did not have Public School Choice for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.	

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	$

1.4.9.1.4 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	

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas did not have Public School Choice for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas did not have Supplemental Educational Services for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.	

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	$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kansas did not have Supplemental Educational Services for 2012-13 due to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.	

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.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	53,804	52,053	96.75	1,751	3.25
All elementary classes	28,550	28,143	98.57	407	1.43
All secondary classes	25,254	23,910	94.68	1,344	5.32

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	44.80
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	42.30
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Teacher reporting alignment to student reporting has created more accurate reporting of Special Education Teachers.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	51.60
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	40.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Teacher reporting alignment to student reporting has created more accurate reporting of Special Education Teachers.

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	7,369	7,251	98.40
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	7,659	7,585	99.03
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	9,272	8,564	92.36
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	6,316	6,155	97.45

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 schoof'?* 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 *" /ow-poverty schoof'?* 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 quartUes detennined?* 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 !Tee 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 forthis 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	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	//
Yes	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.

SIOP is used as a primary support model.

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	49,394
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 in the State 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.	37,385
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	39,979
Undetermined	2,043
Vietnamese	1,410
Chinese	582
Arabic	503

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 (480) and High German (431).

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	45,642
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,674
Total	48,316
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified as accurate. 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	15,794
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	34.60
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	35,002
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,700
Total	36,702
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified as accurate. 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.	2,117

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	22,075	67.13	10,523	32.00
Attained proficiency	11,975	34.21	8,400	24.00
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).	No Response
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No Response
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No Response
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)
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)
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)
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
880	254	1,134
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
964	S	80	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
951	S	90	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
408	S	87	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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	47
//	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	47
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	44
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	0
//	
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 2011-12 and 2012-13)	7
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	7
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	0

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.

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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
2,897	395	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) – The term ' Language instruction educational program ' means an instruction course – (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.	249
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	347

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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	41
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	32
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	30
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	33
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	31
Other (Explain in comment box)	8

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	37	4,337
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	39	1,176
PD provided to principals	29	323
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	21	174
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	22	432
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	44
Total	//////////////////////////////////////	6,486

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These items were reported as 'Other' by the districts:
1) All paraprofessionals were trained in best practices in working with ESL students.
2) Integrating language applications into lesson design.
3) Professional development was provided to certified and classified staff pertaining to ESOL instructional strategies, which included academic vocabulary, SIOP, total participation techniques, common core and anchor charts.
4) Sheltered Instruction.
5) ESL endorsement study classes.
6) Provide instructions in "survival English" for those newcomers that do not speak or understand any English.
7) SCIOP training for elementary teachers.
8) College Course Work: Cultural Diversity; Applied Linguistics; Practicum in ESL Education

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 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/06/12	07/25/12	19
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.

Possibility of e-mailing the award letters rather than preparing for mailing.

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.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOfo/ELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	**#LEAs Reporting Data**
LEAs without subgrants	277	277
LEAs with subgrants	9	9
Total	286	286

Comments: The response 1s llm1ted to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	117	144
K	386	544
1	393	493
2	403	485
3	412	435
4	404	393
5	345	371
6	319	362
7	283	335
8	254	326
9	284	318
10	223	241
11	253	251
12	278	259
Ungraded	13	6
Total	4,367	4,963
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	332	387
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,745	4,270
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	59	38
Hotels/Motels	231	268
Total	4,367	4,963
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	493	356
Migratory children/youth	127	160
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	839	823
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	393	689
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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	144
K	542
1	491
2	480
3	431
4	387
5	368
6	361
7	331
8	326
9	319
10	241
11	250
12	260
Ungraded	6
Total	4,938
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	356
Migratory children/youth	158
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	822
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	689
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 youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	313	223	309	168
4	303	231	295	194
5	268	186	271	187
6	233	184	257	152
7	197	161	241	150
8	181	124	242	134
High School	173	132	160	99
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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	316	226	319	173
4	310	214	294	175
5	270	160	283	182
6	233	135	263	102
7	202	136	239	123
8	182	112	250	99
High School	171	111	171	89
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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4	306	269	298	222
5				
6				
7	201	158	237	122
8				
High School	167	126	160	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				