

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

STATE: Kansas



U.S. Department of Education

Background

Peer reviewers apply their professional judgment and experiences when responding to the questions in response to the criteria below. Consistent with section 1111(a)(4)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), peer reviewers will conduct an objective review of State plans in their totality and out of respect for State and local judgments, with the goal of supporting State- and local-led innovation and providing objective feedback on the technical, educational, and overall quality of a State plan, including the validity and reliability of each element of the State plan. Peer reviewer notes inform the written determination of the Secretary regarding the consolidated State plan.

Role of the Peer Reviewers

- Each peer reviewer will independently review a consolidated State plan with respect to the criteria for Title I, Part A and Title III, Part A and record his or her responses to the questions. Each peer reviewer will note where changes may be necessary for a State educational agency (SEA) to fully address statutory and regulatory requirements and may also present suggestions to improve the State plan or to highlight best practices. Each peer reviewer will create his or her individual recommendations to guide the in-person review. These individual recommendations are submitted to the Department but will not be shared with the State.
- A panel of peer reviewers will meet in person to discuss each SEA's plan. The panel of peer reviewers will generate one set of peer review notes that reflects its collective review and evaluation of the SEA's consolidated State plan, but the panel is not required to reach consensus. The notes should reflect all peer reviewer perspectives on each requirement.

After the peer review is completed, each SEA will receive the final peer review notes that include the peer reviewers' responses to the questions and any recommendations to improve the SEA's consolidated State plan. The peer review notes: 1) constitute the official record of the peer review panel's responses to questions regarding how an SEA's State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements; 2) provide technical assistance to the SEA on how to improve its State plan; and 3) recommend to the Secretary what, if any, additional information to request from the SEA. Taking into consideration the peer reviewers' recommendations, the Department will provide feedback to each SEA that outlines any areas the SEA must address prior to the Secretary's approval of its consolidated State plan. If a State plan cannot be approved, the Department will offer the SEA an opportunity to revise and resubmit its State plan and have a hearing, consistent with ESEA section 8451.

Consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department will make publicly available all peer review guidance, training, and final panel notes. The names of peer reviewers will be made publicly available at the completion of the review of all consolidated State plans. The peer reviewers for any individual State will not be made publicly available.

How to Use This Document

The peer review criteria are intended to: 1) support States as they develop their consolidated State plans, and 2) inform peer reviewer panels as they evaluate each consolidated State plan. This document outlines the required elements that an SEA must address in its State plan in order to fully meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. If an SEA has provided insufficient information for peer reviewers to determine whether any requirement is fully addressed, peer reviewers should indicate that the SEA has not fully addressed that requirement and identify what additional information or clarification may be needed. Note that responses to some elements are required only if the specific circumstances addressed in the question are applicable to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan (*e.g.*, if the SEA establishes an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in addition to a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate).

in item A.4.iii.b.2 below). For these particular questions, if the circumstances addressed in the question do not apply to the SEA, the SEA is not required to answer the question in order to fully address the statutory and regulatory requirements.

Instructions

Each peer reviewer should include individual review notes in the space provided below each consolidated State plan requirement. For each consolidated State plan requirement, a peer reviewer will provide:

- **Peer Analysis**: Describe the peer reviewer's justification for why an SEA did or did not meet the requirement;
- **Strengths**: Summarize the strengths of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement;
- **Weaknesses**: Summarize the weaknesses of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement, including issues, lack of clarity, and possible suggestions for technical assistance; and
- **Assessment**: Determine if the SEA met the State plan requirement (indicated by Yes/No)
 - If the peer reviewer indicates 'No' above, the peer reviewer must describe the specific information or clarification that a State must provide in order to meet the requirement.

The peer reviewer notes should address all of the required elements of each State plan requirement in this document, but need not address each element individually (*i.e.*, the peer reviewer notes should holistically review A.3.i about the SEA's definition for native languages, incorporating each of the four bulleted items in this element but need not individually respond to each bullet).

SECTION A: TITLE I, PART A: IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LEAS

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

Note: State Plan template item A.1 is submitted s part of the separate assessment peer review process consistent with ESEA section 1111(b) and 34 CFR § 200.2(d), and thus has no applicable peer review criteria in this document.

A.2: Eighth Grade Math Exception (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

Note: State Plan template items A.2.i and A.2.ii require binary yes/no responses from SEAs, and thus have no applicable peer review criteria.

A.2.iii: Strategies (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

- If applicable,¹ does the SEA describe, regarding the 8th grade math exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (*e.g.*, appropriate data and evidence that the strategies are likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

¹ In order for an SEA to exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8th grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); b. the student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E); and c. in high school:(1)the student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers for 8th graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2)the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and(3)the student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

A.3: Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4))

A.3.i: Definition

- Does the SEA provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”?
- Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?
- Does the SEA’s definition include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas defines languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population as “any one language where more than five percent of the participating student population statewide speaks the identified language, receives instruction in the native languages and services in the English learners program.” Spanish is the only language that meets this definition (9%). Kansas reviewed factors associated with each of the distinct populations referenced in all of the LEAs in the State.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.ii: Existing Assessments in Languages other than English

- Does the SEA identify any existing assessments that it makes available in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas’ response indicates that assessments in languages other than English are not available although there is a mouse-over tool that translates academic words into Spanish. Assistive technology is available to translate academic words from English to Spanish in Kansas’ math and science assessments in grades 3-8 as well as its high school assessment.

<i>Strengths</i>	Kansas makes additional materials available in American sign language.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

- Does the SEA indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan does not address the assessment of language arts/reading for the Spanish-speaking student population. The technology tools available for the Math and Science assessments are not whole assessments in a language other than English. There may be some debate on whether the translation tool being utilized is adequate for English learners to access science and mathematics test content. The State should provide evidence that supports validity of using the mouse-over tool.
<i>Strengths</i>	Kansas will continue to monitor the prevalence of languages other than English.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The user experience and psychometric defensibility should be assessed when using such tools. The cognitive overload from tool tips used on a high-stakes assessment also brings up issues of fairness to Spanish-speaking test takers.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State must indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population where yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed. The State should address any accommodations that could be made available in language arts/reading testing as well.

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?

- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
 - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
 - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
 - 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (*e.g.*, legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Less than half a percent of students speaks Kansas’ next most populous language – Vietnamese. Kansas will continue monitoring languages other than English statewide to determine if/when additional assessments may be needed. When Kansas develops assessments or other state policies, the State should ensure that LEAs have the resources and support they need to conduct appropriate outreach activities for parents in non-native English speaking communities.</p> <p>One reviewer believes, following a careful analysis of languages other than English listed on page 11, Kansas convincingly argues that there is no need to develop additional assessments at this time.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some reviewers suggested Kansas should provide additional details on its stakeholder outreach activities.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Kansas must describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments</p> <p>If applicable, Kansas must also include an explanation of the reasons (<i>e.g.</i>, legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.</p>

A.4: Statewide Accountability Systems & School Support and Improvement (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))

A.4.i: Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(b)(3), 1111(c)(2))

A.4.i.a: Major Racial and Ethnic Subgroups of Students (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B))

- Does the SEA list each major racial and ethnic group that the SEA includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas lists economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English learners, African-American students, Hispanic students, White students, American Indian/Alaska Native students, native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students, and multi-racial students as subgroups to be included in accountability.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion

- If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its statewide accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.c: Previously Identified English Learners

Note: State Plan template item A.4.i.c requires a binary yes/no response from SEAs, and thus has no applicable peer review criteria.

A.4.i.d: If Applicable, Exception for Recently Arrived English Learners

Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the

exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.

- Does the SEA describe how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner (e.g., a statewide procedure that considers English language proficiency level in determining which, if any, exception applies)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii: Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

A.4.ii.a: Minimum N-Size for Accountability (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Does the SEA provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
- Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas has proposed using a minimum N size of 30 for accountability calculations for all students and each subgroup of students. The minimum N size of 30 is the same state-determined number for all students and each subgroup. One reviewer indicated, however, that an N size of 30 for each subgroup of students is unacceptable since it will likely fail to include significant numbers of students from each subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer stated that Kansas must significantly decrease the minimum N size for accountability calculations for all students and each subgroup. The peer reviewer feels the n-size of 30 is too large.

A.4.ii.b: Statistical Soundness of Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas cites recommendations from its assessment contractor, the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE), state department staff, and technical advisors for this n-size. Two reviewers indicated that the selected minimum number of students is statistically sound.
<i>Strengths</i>	Kansas was very proactive in its efforts to ensure an accurate, valid, reliable and statistically sound minimum n-size for all subgroups of students for its accountability measures. The state’s ongoing process included an impressive group of constituents including statistical and research professionals. A statistical example is provided to justify its n-size choice in order to ascertain the validity of that choice without compromising its reliability.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Ongoing consultation with technical advisors and review of longitudinal data is mentioned but empirical data is not provided. Some reviewers expressed concern that Kansas, citing its previous selection under NCLB, provides little additional information to indicate whether this n-size is statistically sound. However, it is not clear if this n-count remains appropriate for Kansas’ new, updated accountability system. There is no data or evidence that schools with less than 30 students would be erratically identified as low or high performing by chance, as the State claims.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State must provide further data demonstrating that the n-size of 30 is statistically sound. This additional information must confirm Kansas’ n-size is appropriate for including student populations that are typically relatively small, e.g., multi-racial students, which the State has indicated would be accountability subgroups.

A.4.ii.c: How the SEA Determined Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it determined the minimum number of students?

² Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute of Education Sciences report “[Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information](#)” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

- Does the description include how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Some reviewers believed the plan included minimal information on how the determination was made but cited some consultation with constituency groups. The SEA describes the groups it consulted with in order to determine the minimum number of students as “valid and reliable”. Kansas previously cited its use of the n-size from NCLB with no additional explanation of the additional input or consultation it gathered from required stakeholder groups in preparation for identifying the n-size it would use for its accountability system under ESSA.</p> <p>Some reviewers indicated Kansas clearly described how the minimum n-size was determined.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Some peer reviewers believe Kansas’ n-size was not statistically sound.</p> <p>Some peer reviewers indicated stakeholder groups, including parents, should be given the opportunity to have meaningful input in the accountability system entrusted to oversee their students’ outcomes.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA must provide documentation it “collaborated” -- rather than simple consultation – with stakeholder groups representing each of the constituencies required.</p> <p>Kansas should provide further information describing how minimum n-size was determined.</p>

A.4.ii.d: Minimum N-Size and Ensuring Student Privacy (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students?³

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas has appropriately adopted an N size of 10 for reporting purposes. The SEA cites federal guidance and statute as well as state statute to compel protection of student data.
<i>Strengths</i>	Reporting n-count offers more transparency at a reduced size of 10 as compared to its accountability n-count of 30.

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	The State provides evidence to ensure its selection of n-size will not compromise the privacy of individual students and is consistent with ESEA section 1111(i) in information collection and dissemination in a manner that protects privacy and consistent with FERPA. When selecting its minimum n-size in its accountability system KS consulted with statistical and scientific experts to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State should ensure supplementary and complementary redaction techniques are employed beyond standard non-reporting for all cell sizes less than 10.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.e: If Applicable, Minimum N-Size for Reporting

- If the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, does the SEA provide the minimum number of students for purposes of reporting?
- Is the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i), including with respect to privacy and statistical reliability?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas will use a minimum n-size of 10 instead of 30 for reporting purposes. The State’s selected reporting n-size is consistent with the requirements in respect to student privacy and statistical reliability (p. 14).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii: Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

A.4.iii.a.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual

statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?

- Does the SEA identify and describe long-term goals for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas sets long-term goals (by 2030) for all students and subgroups at 75 percent of students scoring at performance levels 3 and 4 combined for English language arts and mathematics. Compared against current proficiency rates, the goals are ambitious. This same goal and timeline would be applied to all subgroups; baseline data is provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	The long-term goals start with a cohort of students entering kindergarten in 2017 and follow them to matriculation while measuring their college and career readiness in each tested grade. This provision encourages systemic improvement from the earliest grades to increase opportunities for postsecondary success. Kansas’ commitment toward rigor in academic skills, employability and citizenship skills for all graduating students affords students options in preparation for college and careers.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.a.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	From 2017 through 2030, Kansas establishes annual incremental targets for all students and each subgroup for the subject areas of English language arts/reading and mathematics.
<i>Strengths</i>	The State’s plan calls for resetting long-term and interim goals once the original long-term goals are met. Interim progress is more intensively monitored through annual, rather than

	periodic, measurement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.a.3: Improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps, such that the State's long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The annual incremental targets set forth are differentiated by subgroup, requiring greater improvement rates for lower-achieving subgroups to attain the common end goal. Each subgroup is expected to improve by at least 1.48% up to almost 5% per year.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer believes equal intervals are not best practice in order to meet requirements. There should be more gradation of goals across years.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer believes KS must submit for approval unequal measurements of interim progress toward closing achievement gaps among student subgroups. Their proposal sets equal increments of progress; however, they should consider setting increments of unequal values.

A.4.iii.b: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term goals for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA's description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA's description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas set a long-term four-year graduation rate goal of 95% requiring an

	increase over the baseline for every subgroup – however slightly for some – over the next 12 years. The timeline and goals are consistently applied for all students and each subgroup of students. Baseline data from the starting point of 2016 are provided, indicating that the goals are ambitious.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Kansas strives to be a world leader in the education of its students and demands higher standards in academic skills as well as employability and citizenship skills for each graduating student.</p> <p>The State’s plan calls for resetting long-term and interim goals once the 95 percent graduation rate is achieved.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>One reviewer noted Kansas’ definition of “long term” is 2030 and setting long term goals 14 years from now is unacceptable and not ambitious.</p> <p>Because the Asian subgroup has 12 years to improve by 2 percentage points, the annual increase needed in that timeframe is barely measureable at 0.15%. Because the gap in graduation rates is not as large as its achievement rate gaps for the 12 year time period, the State should consider an alternate timeline for its graduation rate goals.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer believes KS has not established an ambitious long-term goal as a result of the way in which it chooses to annually measure equal intervals of interim progress toward its goal. This peer reviewer believes Kansas must resubmit ambitious long-term goals.

A.4.iii.b.2: If applicable, long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?
- Are the long-term goals more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas provides annual measurements of interim progress toward long term goals for all students as well as subgroups for the 4 year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The timeline and goals are consistently applied for all students and each subgroup of students. The state does not identify any extended year graduation rate goals.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer believes Kansas should use unequal measurements of interim progress toward meeting long-term goals for all students and for each student subgroup. Because the Asian subgroup has 12 years to improve by 2 percentage points, the annual increase needed in that timeframe is barely measurable at 0.15 percentage points. Because the gap in graduation rates is not as large in the 12 year time period, the State should consider an alternate timeline for its graduation rate goals.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer indicated Kansas must provide more appropriate measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and must also submit for approval better logical measurements of interim progress.

A.4.iii.b.4: Improvement necessary to close statewide graduation rate gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that the State’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	All students and each subgroup of students are expected to make annual progress toward a universal goal of 95% of students graduating within four years. The expected improvements to graduation rates are proportional to the timeframe and baseline identified.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer described Kansas' approach to close statewide graduation gaps as simplistic.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.c: English Language Proficiency (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

A.4.iii.c.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment?
- Does the SEA's description include baseline data?
- Does the SEA's description include the State-determined timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency?
- Is the long-term goal ambitious?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Kansas' goal requires 95% of all English learner students to improve at least one performance index level on Kansas' English Language Proficiency Assessment 2 (KELPA2) by 2030. The state will use KELPA2 scores from 2017 and 2018 to set a baseline. No baseline data are provided, but the State outlines what baseline data will be used once available. Kansas does not provide a state-determined number of years in which they expect EL students to achieve EL proficiency.</p> <p>Kansas proposes a speed-to-proficiency model to measure progress and to set both long-term and interim measures to proficiency. Until its speed-to-proficiency model is available in 2021, progress toward proficiency would be measured annually as a percent of students who have increased at least one English language proficiency assessment performance index level over the previous year.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Performance levels from KELPA2 may prove to be a positive approach to measure incremental growth within performance levels.</p> <p>Kansas' plan acknowledges the complexity of learning a language and the impact of students' age on language acquisition. With that in mind, the State may consider setting different goals for elementary, middle and high school.</p>

	The state plan toward proficiency is quite an ambitious one and provides adequate information to support its long term goals utilizing baseline data, transitional measures of progress and finally speed-to-proficiency measure to set interim and long term goals.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It's unclear if improving performance index levels would result in English language acquisition in an expedient or meaningful timeline. If the baseline data demonstrates only 30 percent of students are making progress toward proficiency and the school meets their unique target of 35% the following year, there is no accountability for the 65% of the students who will have remained stagnant for one or more years. Only one-third of the students would have made measurable progress, but this progress would not have taken into account how long students have remained in a performance level and how much longer they have to receive a free and appropriate public education that prepares them with a high school diploma and the ability to work and learn in English. Kansas' definition of "long term" goal for 2030 -- a goal 14 years from 2016, is not ambitious.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Kansas must establish a state-determined timeline in which English learners would be expected to achieve English language proficiency. This timeline can and should take into account students' initial English proficiency level and grade level upon identification.

A.4.iii.c.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State's plan does not provide measurements of interim progress toward its long-term goal for EL proficiency due to the need to collect additional base line data. Kansas will use two years of data (2017 which has been established and 2018 which has yet to be administered) to establish a true baseline for progress to proficiency. Also, Kansas will collect five years of data (2017-2021) prior to setting speed-to-proficiency interim goals and long-term goals.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	The State must establish quantifiable measurements of interim progress toward their long-term goal of 95% of EL students making progress toward proficiency. If the State wishes to use proportional increments based on two years of data, the State should offer as much information on how it will use baseline data to calculate interim targets toward the long-term goal. The

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	methodology should be based on research and best practice.
---	--

A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

Note: A single indicator may consist of multiple components or measures. Peers must review each such component or measure for compliance with all of the required elements.

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

- Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure(e.g., a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?
- Is the indicator measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?
- Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Kansas’ Academic Achievement indicator is a measure of proficiency toward the long-term goal of at least 75% of all students scoring at performance levels 3 or 4 on the English language arts and mathematics state assessments, KAP.</p> <p>No information was provided to describe how the academic achievement indicator measures the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each subgroup.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear how school accountability ratings would be impacted by not meeting annual interim progress targets toward 75% proficiency by 2030.</p> <p>Kansas does not provide evidence demonstrating how assessments – KAP – used in its academic achievement indicator are valid and reliable for the purposes of measuring students’ grade-level proficiency in ELA and Mathematics.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	<p>Kansas must provide evidence demonstrating the validity and reliability of its academic achievement indicator. Kansas must also clearly articulate and describe how the indicator will measure the performance of at least 95 percent</p>

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup. Kansas must also clearly describe the weighting of English/Language Arts relative to the weight for Mathematics within the academic achievement indicator.
---	---

A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

Note: If the SEA uses a different Other Academic indicator for each grade span, peer reviewers must separately review each indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one Other Academic indicator for elementary schools and a different Other Academic indicator for middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator.

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas' API indicator will evaluate students' relative performance level on Kansas' state test to the State average as its measure of "Other academic indicator." Kansas will quantify relative performance level by assigning weighted points to each of eight performance bands within its state test. This indicator can be disaggregated and is available statewide. However, it is not apparent if this indicator can be considered valid and reliable as a statewide academic indicator.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The API calculation to measure an "other" academic indicator is complex with little added value evident. As schools improve statewide, the state average will increase which may cause the gap to widen despite schools improving their subgroups' performance. Also, only identifying schools more than 1.5 standard deviations from the mean ignores other schools with existing gaps. Gaps between subgroups may be overlooked if a subgroups' performance is compared to a population average which includes their own performance.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	The state must provide evidence demonstrating validity and reliability of the API scores as the other academic indicator.

provide to fully meet this requirement

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

- Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?
- If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Kansas will evaluate three years’ worth of graduation rate data to assess whether schools are on target toward meeting the 95% graduation rate goal by 2030.</p> <p>Although Kansas’ state law does not allow averaging data for very small schools only (pg. 29), it will “calculate the preceding three years” for evaluating whether all other schools met the annual targets. It is unclear how the State will conduct this calculation.</p> <p>The State does not provide more specific information about how it will average data in order to calculate the graduation indicator. It is unclear if the State will sum the number of graduates across three years and divide by the number of students in those cohorts for each of those years or if the State will simply average each of the individual four-year graduation rates for the preceding three years. It should be noted, that the latter method would not account for variations in cohort size for each of those years.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The indicator is aligned to the goal. Schools who meet the 2030 goal exceed expectations while schools which meet the interim progress targets meet expectations.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The indicators used – exceeds, meets, etc. – are less transparent about what percentage of students graduate within four years or what percentage of subgroups the school graduates.
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))

<i>all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State must describe how it calculates the graduation rate indicator using three years' of data for non-small schools – specifically describing the method used to average data across three years.

A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator

- Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?
- Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
- Does the SEA's description include the State's definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas restates its goals for the percentage of students expected to increase their performance index one band by 2030. The SEA identifies how it will report EL proficiency indicator, but it is still only currently considering how to include such a measure in its statewide accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	KELPA2 (page 29) has yet to be approved through the U.S. Department of Education's assessment peer review process to determine it is valid and reliable.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Kansas must detail how the indicator is valid and reliable. Although Kansas intends to collect five years of data to calculate its speed to proficiency indicator, the State's system of meaningful differentiation must include an ELP indicator from the outset. Kansas must describe how the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligns with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1.

A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)

Note: Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA's description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))

- Does the SEA describe each School Quality or Student Success indicator used in its statewide accountability system for all public schools in the State?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas' sole School Quality Student Success indicator evaluates whether 5% or fewer students perform at the combined API levels of 1 and 2 in grades 3-8 and grade 10 (pg. 32). The indicator allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance and can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The API adds unnecessary complexity to the state's accountability system with no documented benefits. The State should ensure that the thresholds set to differentiate among schools that are below, meeting and exceeding expectations on the SQSS measure provide appropriate variation amongst the distribution of schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))

A.4.v.a: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- Does the SEA describe its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State?
- Is the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation based on all indicators in the State's accountability system?
- Does the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation include the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State's accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas will use an "alternate index" or "A+" (p. 34) to differentiate all schools. Schools will initially be identified for comprehensive and targeted supports and remaining schools will receive a ranking based on a combined weighting of additional indicators not previously included – chronic absenteeism and disciplinary rates. A+ does not include all required indicators – achievement or the API score is the only indicator included at a weight of 60%. Graduation, EL progress/proficiency, and the academic gap measure are not included in the A+ score, but they are used in the criteria for identifying

	schools for comprehensive and targeted support. These measures used outside the “A+” methodology mean they are not included in the state’s system of annual meaningful differentiation. The state strongly supports its decision based on its collaboration with stakeholders.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Kansas presents a variation of its API measure to evaluate the proportion of students scoring in the lowest performance level on KAP. However, this indicator is not utilized in the system of meaningful differentiation or identification criteria for schools in need of comprehensive or targeted supports and improvement. In addition to being inconsistent with Kansas’ goal for 75% proficiency statewide, it is unclear how targeting less than 5% in the lowest performance level factors into Kansas’ statewide accountability system or the impact this indicator has on schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	KS must include all indicators identified under (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)) in its annual system of meaningful differentiation. Specifically, Kansas must clarify how the progress of English learners and four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates will be incorporated into the accountability system. If the state wishes to include chronic absenteeism and discipline data, these measures should be presented as school quality or student success indicators to ensure all indicators in Kansas’ system are valid and reliable and results in a system which meaningfully differentiates among schools.

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

- Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (e.g., for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Because Kansas does not include all indicators in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, it cannot describe the weight of each required indicator. Instead, it assigns the majority of the weight to a school’s academic achievement – or API – at 60% and then assigns weight to chronic absenteeism and disciplinary rates based on effect size.</p> <p>The plan does not outline how Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive substantial weight individually nor how these indicators have greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s) or how these indicators have greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator, in the aggregate. Small n-size cases are not discussed.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	

<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer expressed concern regarding an imbalance of weight having the potential to create disproportionate and inequitable practices for all students.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The state must assign substantial weight to each of the indicators identified for academic achievement, other academic indicators, graduation rate, and progress in achieving EL proficiency. Kansas must also include its SQSS measure among the weighted indicators ensuring that other indicators receive “in the aggregate, much greater weight” as required in A.4.v.b.

A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State’s plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies, including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Does the SEA’s description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Although the A+ index does not include all required indicators the state

	previously identified in its plan, Kansas describes its methodology to identify the lowest 5% of schools based on its A+ index. This does result in identification of 5% of schools; however, these schools would not necessarily be the lowest performing on all required indicators. Kansas indicates the SEA identified schools in the fall of 2016 which is inconsistent with ESSA requirement for “beginning with the school year 2017-2018” or department guidance. Because of previous identification in 2016-2017, the State would not identify schools again until 2020.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The chronic absenteeism and school discipline indicators added to the A+ index could lead to the misidentification of schools if many of the factors associated with chronic absenteeism and disciplinary actions – poverty and race/ethnicity in particular – can account for up to 40% of the school’s score.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The state must comply with the timeline for identifying schools in the beginning of 2018-2019 and every three years thereafter. Identification must be based on all required indicators the state describes in its consolidated plan under (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)).

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State will annually identify schools graduating less than 67% of students within four years of entering high school. This information will be reported on the State’s dashboard beginning in 2019.</p> <p>Three reviewers found conflicting information throughout the plan regarding low graduation rate identification. Page 36 contains a table indicating Kansas’ 2016 graduation rates disaggregated from the yearly rate of gain required in years 2017 through 2030. Subsequent graphic on page 37 indicates 2017 as the baseline year instead with updates in 2020 and every three years thereafter. Kansas offers an alternate timeline for identification in a subsequent table (pg. 41).</p> <p>One reviewer inferred the state to meet the timeline requirements because the state’s plan indicates it will identify schools by the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	According to three peer reviewers, the state must clarify the timeline (pgs. 36-37, 41) it will use to identify low graduation rate schools for comprehensive support.

A.4.vi.c: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (*i.e.*, based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Kansas’ methodology to identify schools receiving additional targeted supports results in the identification of 32 schools with the largest number of subgroups performing 1.5 standard deviations under the State’s API average. Kansas’ methodology results in the identification of 32 schools regardless of how many subgroups are consistently underperforming in schools throughout the state. Kansas’ methodology would not result in the identification of schools in which any one subgroup’s performance would not receive additional targeted support and may need eventual comprehensive support.</p> <p>Some reviewers indicate that KS clearly identifies schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on the identification as a school in which the lowest performance of subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a state determined number of years.</p> <p>The State will identify schools every three years beginning in 2020.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear where the quantity of 32 schools comes from since there is no cap or minimum requirement on additional targeted support schools. This methodology is heavily normed and would not effectively improve achievement gaps among all subgroups with a verified need to improve performance.
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s))

<i>all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One reviewer believes the state must identify a methodology that ensures all additional targeted support schools unable to improve the performance of underperforming subgroups for an extended period of time can receive comprehensive support (rather than limiting the number of schools identified for comprehensive support after receiving additional targeted support, see page 38 of the Plan).

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
- Does the SEA’s timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The state will identify comprehensive support schools in three year intervals after the initial identification year.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?
- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas defines each term – consistently, underperforming, and subgroup but does not provide an operation definition for its “consistently underperforming subgroup.” Its identification methodology fails to include all required indicators nor does it include the indicators in Kansas’ A+ index. Kansas proposes to use the API scores 1.5SD below the state mean to annually identify schools for targeted support. Only five percent of schools would be identified for targeted support.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Only five percent of schools would be identified for targeted support although many more consistently underperforming subgroups would be enrolled in

	schools without supports.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Kansas must include all required indicators for meaningful differentiation in its methodology, rather than only API (ESEA sections 1111(c)(4)(B) and 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii)). Additionally, Kansas' methodology must result in the identification of any and all schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups.

A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA's methodology result in identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department's guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas' methodology does not address the mandate to identify schools for additional targeted support based on the performance of subgroups at all. In 2020, the KSDE will identify schools lagging in KAP results and among the lowest 5% of Title I schools (pg. 42). This approach fails to identify schools where subgroups perform so much lower than the rest of the school or very similarly to students in the lowest 5% of schools in the state. The table on page 41 and the language on page 42 are inconsistent.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The state's methodology must identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D). The state must provide a timeline compliant with federal statute and guidance as well as the frequency of identification after the initial year of identification.

A.4.vi.g: If Applicable, Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

- If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, does the SEA describe those categories?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?
- If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (e.g., 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state’s accreditation system, Kansas Education Systems Accreditation, requires 95% test participation; however, it’s unclear if this requirement results in the loss of accreditation for districts, schools, or any other corrective action. Regardless, the state’s accreditation system has played no role in the state’s accountability system so any impact to accreditation does not result in a lower summative rating from the state’s accountability system. The state does not indicate any plans to base the academic achievement measure on 95% of all students or the number of students tested – whichever is greater. Schools would be flagged for corrective action if less than 95% of students assess for two years in a row.</p> <p>Additionally, Kansas’ accreditation system will take action only if a “district, school or subgroup” misses the 95% participation standard for “all students and all subgroups” (p. 43) for two consecutive years.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Corrective action would be based on “qualitative and quantitative risk factors” (pg. 43), but there is no additional information on whether KSDE’s “ongoing technical assistance” has been an effective lever to improve low test participation rates in schools and districts.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the</i>	The state must – at a minimum – include 95% of all students or the number of

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	students, if greater, in its annual measure of academic achievement. If the state chooses to take additional action such as corrective action plans or state intervention, it could also be included in the state’s plan. Kansas must measure achievement annually regardless of any additional actions the state chooses to take every two years.
--	--

A.4.viii: Continued Support for School and Local Educational Agency Improvement (ESEA Section 1111(d)(3)(A))

A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Is the number of years no more than four years?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (*e.g.*, do the exit criteria improve student outcomes and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>In order to exit comprehensive support status after two years, schools/districts must maintain a school improvement plan, document spending of 1003 funds on evidence-based interventions aligned to a needs assessment, improve disciplinary rates and chronic absenteeism, and demonstrate progress in ELA and math on the state’s assessment or another valid and reliable test. Alternatively, comprehensive support schools with low graduation rates would be required to improve those graduation rates above 67%.</p> <p>The exit criteria are likely to ensure a school would no longer receive an A+ score in the lowest 5% of the state by improving two of the three measures in the A+ index. Schools do not have to improve ELA and Mathematics proficiency on KAP if they demonstrate progress on another test. This means that KAP ELA and mathematics scores could continue to lag behind the rest of the state or even decrease from the initial year of identification. This poorly aligns with the state’s long-term goal, ELA and math proficiency – on KAP specifically. If other high quality assessments are valid and reliable, they would produce proficiency results similar to the state’s assessment. If the school continues to perform in the lowest 5% based on the most recent A+ index, it would be continuously identified for on-going comprehensive support.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Formal, structured support for the implementation of school improvement plans and requirement to expend funds on evidence-based strategies are included in exit criteria (although it would be counterintuitive for a school that improves but does not have evidence of 1003 spending to continue to receive comprehensive/financial support).</p> <p>The state provides clear guidance for all schools including high schools in order to grant exit status.</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Kansas should ensure that all assessments used to determine exit eligibility (p. 43) are valid and reliable.</p> <p>As an unintended consequence, both chronic absenteeism and disciplinary rates would be remedied by an increase in the number of students dropping out of school. This would also impact achievement scores if these students are also lower achieving as they often are. The only accountability for high school completion would occur with a single cohort in grade 12 and even then, only schools with graduation rates less than 67% would be identified.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	KS provides clearly defined information for schools and districts receiving additional targeted support in order to be eligible for exit status under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C).
<i>Strengths</i>	Kansas’ plan includes a monitored, structured process for implementation of school improvement plans.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.c: More Rigorous Interventions (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe the more rigorous State-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years, which may include interventions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting or the school day and year?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas’ plan briefly references “additional technical assistance” (pg. 45). Very little information is offered to describe what interventions would be more rigorous. The state only reiterates the same interventions used for comprehensive support from initial identification.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Redirecting resources from the school to the district level may not inherently improve the school or address reasons for low performance. This is clearly not more rigorous as required in this section. More of the same does not meet the criterion for more rigorous interventions.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Kansas must provide a description of the more rigorous state-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years.

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas plans to conduct the resource review during the period of time schools are identified for comprehensive support. This process will be integrated within the ongoing monitoring process the KSDE implements. It is unclear who would be responsible for these periodic reviews and how they would differ – if at all – from its current monitoring practices.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	Kansas must describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.
---	--

A.4.viii.e: Technical Assistance (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas provides technical assistance to support LEAs that serve a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. Kansas has implemented a comprehensive technical assistance system that can be tailored to individual plans for schools' needs.
<i>Strengths</i>	The state clearly presents evidence of numerous resources of Technical Assistance agencies and programs that implement evidence-based best practices.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.f: If Applicable, Additional Optional Action

- If applicable, does the SEA describe the action that it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that it consistently identifies for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting the State's exit criteria or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))

- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the measures (*e.g.*, data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?⁴

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas’ data demonstrates that schools with higher rates of low-income and minority students also have higher rates of inexperienced teachers. The state found no significant gaps in minority and low-income students served by out-of-field teachers. The state did not describe measure it uses to evaluate whether ineffective teachers are serving low-income and minority students at higher rates. Teacher effectiveness data are only available at an aggregated, school level; however, scatter plots used by the state to demonstrate gaps are also analyzed at the school level.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Kansas must describe the extent to which minority and low-income students are served by ineffective teachers.

A.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))

⁴ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas leverages Title I, Part A funds to support district programs focused on reducing incidences of bully/harassment, overuse of discipline practices, and aversive behavior interventions. The plan also describes the actions the state plans to take to improve school conditions for student learning through social and emotional character development.
<i>Strengths</i>	The state provides technical assistance for schools and families in order support the health and safety of all students. Strategies include but not limited to evidence-based, Multi-Tiered System of Supports training for districts and positive behavior supports for educators and families.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas describes multiple activities designed to support all schools in meeting the needs of students especially as they transition from middle to high school.
<i>Strengths</i>	Kansas utilizes evidence-based programs like Chicago’s Early Warning System to assist districts in reducing dropout rates. The state provides information to support at-risk students in elementary, middle and high schools to improve successful outcomes.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer noted, while postsecondary education is important and clearly the goal for KS, there is no mention of preparing students for employment

	tracks specifically. Career readiness is critical for students who do not plan to attend postsecondary education. Career Technical Education (CTE) is a critical component in preparing students for employment and a valuable resource that provides work base learning and apprenticeship opportunities in a variety of fields that are competitive with a promising future economic forecast.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

SECTION E: TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND ENHANCEMENT

E.1: Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2))

- Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?
- Does the SEA’s description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas identified how they meaningfully consulted with their education partners in establishing entrance and exit procedures. Schools are required to test referred students on a state-approved screener within 30 days of enrolling in the school. Kansas uses its KELPA2 to qualify students for exit from EL proficiency services.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Kansas does not include how information will be provided to families in their native language to the extent possible.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

E.2: SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))

- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goal, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessment under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G)?
- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas will provide “technical assistance and professional learning, including face-to-face trainings, webinars, and individual communications” to help EL students achieve EL and academic proficiency.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One reviewer noted Kansas does not include how information will be provided to families.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

E.3: Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8))

- Does the SEA describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency?
- Does the SEA describe the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as by providing technical assistance and support on how to modify such strategies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Kansas meets the requirements in defining how it will monitor progress of eligible entities receiving Title III, Part A sub-grant in helping English language learners achieve proficiency. The state uses an integrated accountability system that examines qualitative and quantitative risk factors affecting compliance and performance. Kansas offers technical assistance and support to eligible schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	The state uses multiple indicators to ensure language acquisition and academic progress.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The state could provide more detail on what risk factors would be monitored related to the achievement of English language acquisition. Although increasing parent engagement is mentioned the state’s overall plan, Kansas provides no information as to how parents will be informed or notified regarding the process for identification, assessments, progress or lack thereof,

	regarding their child’s educational program in English or their native home language.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	