CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

KANSAS

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies–State, local, and Federal–is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- o   Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o   Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o   Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- o   Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o   Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- o   Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o   Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- o   Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o   Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o   Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o   Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- o   Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- o   Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o   Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- o   Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

PART II

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome.   Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2006-07 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
    _X_ Part I, 2006-07   ___Part II, 2006-07

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

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

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Judi Miller

Telephone: 785-296-5081

Fax: 785-296-5867

e-mail: judim@ksde.org

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Judi Miller

_____   _Friday, March 7, 2008, 10:14:09 PM_
    Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NoChild LeftBehind

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has <u>not</u> made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reading and Mathematics—Final revised standards to State Board July, 2010

Science---Final revised standards to State Board August, 2014

The Kansas legislature passed a law which places content standards that are assessed on a 7-year review cycle.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has <u>not</u> made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned until content standards are revised.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has <u>not</u> made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Science general, modified, and alternate assessments are planned in Grades 4, 7, and high school for the first time in Spring, 2008 under NCLB. Academic achievement standards will be set in June, 2008. A native language assessment in science will be made available in Spring, 2009.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Academic achievement standards for general, modified, and alternate assessments (Grades 4, 7, and high school) in science will be set in June, 2008. The assessment will be administered from mid-March to late April. At this point, the methodology for those standard-setting activities has not been determined.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and it does <u>not</u> include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	238672	234422	98.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	3958	3939	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5936	5907	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20768	20685	99.6
Hispanic	29000	28873	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	173266	172749	99.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	31079	30860	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13995	13925	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	93455	93094	99.6
Migratory students	2549	2534	99.4
Male	120838	120354	99.6
Female	114364	114068	99.7
Comments: The discrepancy between Table 1.2.1 and 1.3.1 in the total number of students assessed still being investigated.			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11560	38.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9938	33.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6352	21.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2000	6.7
Total	29850	
Comments: The discrepancy in data from table 1.2.2 with tables 1.2.1 and 1.3.1 and has not been resolved. Further study of metadata is needed. The above table does not include any student exempted from the assessment.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	237447	233208	98.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	3973	3960	99.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	5787	5763	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20750	20664	99.6
Hispanic	28667	28514	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	172857	172408	99.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	30851	30632	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13490	13403	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	92264	91909	99.6
Migratory students	2739	2719	99.3
Male	120145	119693	99.6
Female	113792	113515	99.8
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11013	36.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10185	33.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	7182	23.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2090	6.9
Total	30470	
Comments: The discrepancies between table 1.2.4 and 1.2.3 and 1.3.2 have not been resolved. Further review of the metadata are needed. The numbers in table 1.2.4 do not include any students exempted from assessments.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does <u>not</u> include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33568	28762	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	547	462	84.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	905	816	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3114	2146	68.9
Hispanic	4817	3758	78.0
White, non-Hispanic	23849	21296	89.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4707	3527	74.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3152	2322	73.7
Economically disadvantaged students	15227	12011	78.9
Migratory students	352	260	73.9
Male	17182	14807	86.2
Female	16386	13955	85.2
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficiency; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33536	27874	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	555	437	78.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	896	762	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3122	2032	65.1
Hispanic	4746	3282	69.2
White, non-Hispanic	23883	21085	88.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4714	3424	72.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3053	1908	62.5
Economically disadvantaged students	15157	11244	74.2
Migratory students	343	223	65.0
Male	17178	13969	81.3
Female	16358	13905	85.0
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32565	27998	86.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	552	454	82.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	915	817	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2943	2073	70.4
Hispanic	4483	3387	75.6
White, non-Hispanic	23398	21019	89.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4485	3338	74.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2620	1784	68.1
Economically disadvantaged students	14254	11206	78.6
Migratory students	378	295	78.0
Male	16641	14339	86.2
Female	15924	13659	85.8

Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32528	27585	84.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	554	462	83.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	888	763	85.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2948	2011	68.2
Hispanic	4435	3106	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	23429	21004	89.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4487	3322	74.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2526	1499	59.3
Economically disadvantaged students	14197	10777	75.9
Migratory students	375	246	65.6
Male	16633	13920	83.7
Female	15895	13665	86.0

Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33066	27986	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	570	450	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	889	791	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2926	2005	68.5
Hispanic	4346	3250	74.8
White, non-Hispanic	24034	21228	88.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4609	3125	67.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2500	1683	67.3
Economically disadvantaged students	13934	10634	76.3
Migratory students	401	292	72.8
Male	16973	14375	84.7
Female	16093	13611	84.6
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33008	27200	82.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	570	455	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	860	720	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2924	1936	66.2
Hispanic	4283	2779	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	24069	21054	87.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4615	3093	67.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2394	1263	52.8
Economically disadvantaged students	13874	9984	72.0
Migratory students	399	265	66.4
Male	16941	13755	81.2
Female	16067	13445	83.7
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33407	26869	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	608	461	75.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	784	685	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3025	1723	57.0
Hispanic	4210	2853	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	24505	20925	85.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4491	2666	59.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1929	1109	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13658	9332	68.3
Migratory students	439	248	56.5
Male	17061	13725	80.4
Female	16346	13144	80.4

Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficiency; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33398	27516	82.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	607	482	79.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	773	643	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3028	1906	62.9
Hispanic	4169	2767	66.4
White, non-Hispanic	24546	21489	87.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4491	2954	65.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1863	953	51.2
Economically disadvantaged students	13610	9638	70.8
Migratory students	436	249	57.1
Male	17059	13794	80.9
Female	16339	13722	84.0

Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33977	25898	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	588	407	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	827	679	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3161	1696	53.7
Hispanic	4106	2447	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	25012	20469	81.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4396	2326	52.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1539	712	46.3
Economically disadvantaged students	13351	8379	62.8
Migratory students	470	273	58.1
Male	17692	13290	75.1
Female	16285	12608	77.4
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficiency; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33973	28697	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	590	482	81.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	815	690	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3163	2062	65.2
Hispanic	4060	2811	69.2
White, non-Hispanic	25061	22432	89.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4397	2868	65.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1476	748	50.7
Economically disadvantaged students	13305	9779	73.5
Migratory students	470	315	67.0
Male	17697	14524	82.1
Female	16276	14173	87.1
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34257	24819	72.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	603	384	63.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	783	645	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3042	1546	50.8
Hispanic	4078	2182	53.5
White, non-Hispanic	25484	19890	78.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4372	2082	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1465	552	37.7
Economically disadvantaged students	13080	7598	58.1
Migratory students	430	207	48.1
Male	17647	12632	71.6
Female	16610	12187	73.4
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34243	27642	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	606	456	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	775	645	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3055	1887	61.8
Hispanic	4026	2459	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	25514	21991	86.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4381	2642	60.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1388	516	37.2
Economically disadvantaged students	13042	8879	68.1
Migratory students	427	232	54.3
Male	17634	13902	78.8
Female	16609	13740	82.7
Comments: The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	33405	24264	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	469	291	62.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	807	642	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2485	1121	45.1
Hispanic	2861	1481	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	26250	20372	77.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3772	1761	46.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	741	258	34.8
Economically disadvantaged students	9561	5421	56.7
Migratory students	64	24	37.5
Male	17075	12497	73.2
Female	16330	11767	72.1

Comments: This is the first year of the impact of the "Opportunity to Learn" testing process at the high school which means that districts have the option to test students after they've had the opportunity to learn the appropriate standards rather than have all testing occur at one grade level. Also, the student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficienty; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.The student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32435	25635	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	477	346	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	755	570	75.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2439	1325	54.3
Hispanic	2805	1573	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	25797	21707	84.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3536	1788	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	694	155	22.3
Economically disadvantaged students	8724	5450	62.5
Migratory students	270	134	49.6
Male	16522	12760	77.2
Female	15913	12875	80.9

Comments: This is the first year of the impact of the "Opportunity to Learn" testing process at the high school which means that districts have the option to test students after they've had the opportunity to learn the appropriate standards rather than have all testing occur at one grade level. Also, the student records in the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)system is the master file for determining who participated in assessments. This information is provided to the testing contractor for pre-slugging answer sheets and processing assessment results. Since the KIDS system was in its 2nd year in 2006-2007, the districts were doing a better job of completing the appropriate KIDS collections accurately. In addition, the expectation throughout the state is that greater numbers of students will reach proficiency; therefore, increases may exceed the 10% validation issue.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1388	1221	88.0
Districts	296	262	88.5
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	679	606	89.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	296	239	80.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	383	367	95.8
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts.* The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
296	253	85.5
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))[1]
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kansas implements a Tier System of Support when providing technical assistance to schools and districts identified for improvement. Tier 1 technical assistance is available for all school and districts, with a focus on schools and districts "on watch" for improvement status. Tier 2 technical assistance targets schools and districts on improvement. Tier 2 technical assistance includes:

â€¢ Workshop on developing an Integrated Improvement Plan. This workshop includes information on:

o the Kansas 8 step improvement process,

o root cause analysis,

o needs assessments including the Kansas Integrated Needs Assessment,

o first and second order change.

â€¢ Support from a State Technical Assistance Team.

â€¢ KSDE consultation in the development or refinement of the Integrated Improvement Plans.

â€¢ A technical assistance review (peer review) of the Integrated Improvement Plans for both district and school plans.

â€¢ Feedback from KSDE on the Integrated Improvement Plan.

â€¢ Feedback from KSDE on the implementation of the Integrated Improvement Plan via on-cite visits.

Tier 3 technical assistance targets those schools and districts in corrective action or restructuring. Tier 3 technical assistance includes the above support and

â€¢ KSDE guidance for corrective action and restructuring

â€¢ In collaboration with the district, corrective action and/or restructuring options are selected.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

---

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

INTERVENING TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES:

When districts and/or schools enter into corrective action or restructuring, they are provided Tier 3 technical assistance which includes:

• Workshop on developing an Integrated Improvement Plan. This workshop includes information on:

o the Kansas 8 step improvement process,

o root cause analysis,

o needs assessments including the Kansas Integrated Needs Assessment,

o first and second order change.

• Support from a State Technical Assistance Team.

• KSDE consultation in the development or refinement of the Integrated Improvement Plans including the corrective action or restructuring options

• KSDE guidance for corrective action and restructuring options

• In collaboration with the district, corrective action and/or restructuring options are selected

• A technical assistance review (peer review) of the Integrated Improvement Plans for both district and school plans

• Feedback from KSDE on the Integrated Improvement Plan

• Feedback from KSDE on the implementation of the Integrated Improvement Plan via on-cite visits.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	4
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	10/09/07	10/09/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	5/30/07	5/30/07
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	**# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation**
Districts	2	2
Schools	10	7
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	10/09/07

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Any Title I school on improvement may apply for the funds. Those who are planning to restructure, implement restructuring and in corrective action have the first priority for funding. The funds are distributed via formula based on those who apply. The funds are used primarily for implementing professional development that supports the school improvement plan, corrective action plan and/or the restructuring plan.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools *from which* students transferred for public school choice	18
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	16
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:
(1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
(2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
(3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	10745
Who applied to transfer	623
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	623

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 457119
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

   - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
   - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
   - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.[3]

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

---

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	13
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	5510
Who applied for supplemental educational services	1278
Who received supplemental educational services	1151
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 1496195
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 **TEACHER QUALITY**

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught <u>by</u> teachers who are highly qualified <u>and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified</u> will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools	80378	70964	88.3	9414	11.7
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	3344	3165	94.6	179	5.4
Low-poverty schools	3622	3537	97.7	85	2.3
All elementary schools	14158	13785	97.4	373	2.6
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	18289	13216	72.3	5073	27.7
Low-poverty schools	21950	20008	91.2	1942	8.8
All secondary schools	66220	57179	86.3	9041	13.7
Comments: The explanation changed from 2005-06 to 2006-07 for counting elementary classes. Each assignment is now counted as 1 class; thus the difference in the elementary data.					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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

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

g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	47.6
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	22.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.5
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	74.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	24.2
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	61.1	29.9
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch.	
Secondary schools	45.6	23.2
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program =** Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program =** Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html.
3. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction =** Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI =** Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	**OLOI**
6	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
	Two-way immersion			
6	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	90.0	10.0
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
19	Sheltered English instruction			
20	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
38	Content-based ESL			
19	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			
Comments: The bilingual programs vary but most are 90/10.				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

In the table below, provide the underlined number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	22523
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	27169
Vietnamese	1142
Chinese	527
German	521
Arabic	490

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

<u>**Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:**</u>

- **Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal =** Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point =** Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	26735
Not tested/State annual ELP	2058
Subtotal	28793
LEP/One Data Point	12448
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the underlined number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal =** Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	21333
Not tested/State annual ELP	1190
Subtotal	22523
LEP/One Data Point	9408
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	__Yes__
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	__Yes__
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress =** Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress =** Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target =** AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results =** Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y =** Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	20.0	21148	78.0	Y
No progress		1251		
ELP attainment	15.0	4336	17.0	Y
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target =** AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y =** Met the annual target, "Met/N" **=** did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	20.0	17706	83.0	Y
No progress		0		
ELP attainment	15.0	3627	17.0	Y
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

1. **Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**
    - Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
    - Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.
2. **Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.
3. **MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	3559
MFLEP/AYP grades	2485
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

1. **LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do <u>not</u> include pre-K students.
2. **LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
3. **LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but <u>not</u> in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	11882
LEP HS/Non-AYP	3415
LEP other grades	85
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	Spanish
6	Spanish
7	Spanish
8	Spanish
HS	Spanish
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
415	154	37.1
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2069	1490	3559
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLELP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2110	1695	80.3	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The number in 1.6.3.4.3 is greater than the number provided above in 1.6.3.6.2. The first number reflects all monitored students in the AYP grades; the number on this page reflects those who were available during the testing window.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2107	1686	80.0	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: Again, the total number of monitored former ELLs is greater in 1.6.3.4.3 as it reflects the total number; whereas, the number on this page reflects those enrolled during the testing window.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) reserved funds for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	38
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	31
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	6
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	5
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, indicate whether the State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs.
Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	__No__
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	__No__
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301 (6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants =** Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do <u>not</u> include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2586	407	5

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	_Yes_	Multi-year	_No_
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	_No Response_	Formula	_Yes_

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1188
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. Or number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	2239
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

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

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity =** Subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees =** Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants =** Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	31	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	31	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	38	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	31	
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	38	
PD provided to principals	0	
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	0	
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	15	
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	0	
Total		
Comments: Data was not collected on the number of participants.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation =** Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees =** Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/$$ Distribution =** Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/10/07	07/18/07	8
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

If the U.S. Department of Education would send preliminary allocations by June 1, it would shorten the time needed to send out final allocations. In some instances, consortia need to be created as a district may fall below the $10,000 threshold. This can slow the process of sending out allocations. The Kansas State Department of Education calculates the allocations as soon as the grant award is received. Title III is usually the last grant award that is received by the Kansas State Department of Education.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:
http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: No schools have been identified as persistently dangerous.	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	90.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	81.2
Hispanic	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	91.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	85.7
Limited English proficient	71.2
Economically disadvantaged	84.9
Migratory students	
Male	87.5
Female	90.9
Comments: The migrant graduation rate is not available at this time.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3.1
Hispanic	3.0
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1.5
Limited English proficient	2.3
Economically disadvantaged	2.2
Migratory students	1.8
Male	1.9
Female	1.6
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	289	284
LEAs with subgrants	7	7
Total	296	291
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25	288
K	184	181
1	182	192
2	127	164
3	142	168
4	132	131
5	125	123
6	105	119
7	111	117
8	88	105
9	136	92
10	111	93
11	104	52
12	97	75
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1669	1900
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	227	637
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1285	1124
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	65	22
Hotels/Motels	92	117
Total	1669	1900
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	96
K	177
1	167
2	155
3	126
4	127
5	100
6	112
7	114
8	123
9	74
10	88
11	47
12	64
Ungraded	0
Total	1570
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	305
Migratory children/youth	16
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	45
Limit English proficient students	121
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	5
2. Expedited evaluations	4
3. Staff professional development and awareness	7
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
5. Transportation	6
6. Early childhood programs	4
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	6
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	5
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	7
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	7
12. Counseling	6
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
15. School supplies	6
16. Referral to other programs and services	7
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
18. Other (optional)	1
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	4
2. School Selection	3
3. Transportation	5
4. School records	3
5. Immunizations	3
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	3
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	123	70
4	92	60
5	95	58
6	78	42
7	91	42
8	78	40
High School	43	17
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	115	65
4	92	56
5	89	63
6	81	35
7	80	46
8	75	28
High School	42	15
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the underlined statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	637
K	372
1	356
2	332
3	279
4	266
5	236
6	254
7	188
8	190
9	220
10	165
11	128
12	74
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	533
Total	
Comments: The migrant child count in the CSPR is correct as is.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of eligible migrant children continue to decrease in Kansas for a variety of reasons.

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

â€¢ Due to the implementation of the new Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance, October 23, 2003, our State has not been able to obtain information from agribusiness processors to support State industrial surveys. Without this information, the State of Kansas has lost the last of the students who were qualified under the old guidance.

â€¢ Recruiters have been fully trained, provided staff development, and are being monitored in the field. However, Kansas continues to experience problems in Identification and Recruitment as a result of statements from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) regarding fines or possible imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001. Because of this recruiters continue to approach ID&R with some reluctance. This does eliminate some families that may in fact be eligible for migrant services.

â€¢ During the 2006-2007 counting period the national political issues dealing with immigration continues to have an adverse effect on ID&R in our State. As our migrant recruiters make interpretations of U.S. laws regarding immigration and immigrant workers, they continue to show doubt in working with these families. Many of these families may be migrant and have been overlooked due to the political climate on immigration.

â€¢ Due to the continuing economic downturn and the uncertainty of foreign markets, some producers in Kansas continue to limit their employment of seasonal and temporary agricultural workers. This continues to lead producers to layoff workers and make uncertain the employment of seasonal and temporary workers. This limits worker mobility.

â€¢ The economic downturn continues to limit worker mobility within our State, many families are settling out. Thus, the Kansas migrant population is not as mobile as in the past.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	124
K	54
1	64
2	65
3	60
4	44
5	33
6	28
7	37
8	23
9	19
10	<N
11	<N
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	569
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> â€¢ The reduction in summer program numbers continues to be a direct reflection of the reduction of the category 1 count.
>
> â€¢ The decrease in worker mobility continues to adversely limit the summer count of eligible migrant children.
>
> â€¢ The Office of Migrant Education (OME) has stated that migrant children to be counted during the summer must be part of a rigorous summer educational program. This mandate from OME has eliminated some migrant children because, while they did receive services they could not be counted due to not being part of a rigorous summer educational program.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> The State of Kansas continues to use the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN), a state web based migrant database developed in 2001-2002, for compiling and generating the 2006-2007 child counts.
>
> Yes, the same system was used to generate the child counts for the last reporting period.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? <u>If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

(a) The following data was collected and entered into the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN): the migrant student's name, parents, guardian, address, date of birth, city, state, zip code, gender, birth city, birth state, birth country, race birth verification, grade, moved to, status, enrollment date, residency date, qualifying arrival date, residency only verification date, Certificate of Eligibility (COE) number, USD#, district name, COE approval date, school building, end eligibility date, enrollment type, withdrawal date, withdrawal reason and priority for service data.

(b) Migrant recruiters interviewed potential eligible migrant families. During the interview, the recruiter completed a COE. The parent signs it and is given a copy of the COE. Once a migrant program recruiter completed a Kansas Certificate of Eligibility (COE), it was submitted to the COE Approval Team for review and approval. After the COE was approved, the initial information, i.e. name and qualifying arrival date, was entered into the KMSN by staff at the COE Approval Team office. Once that data was entered into the KMSN, districts were responsible for entering school history data, enrollment data, program supplemental codes, priority for service data and other pertinent educational and health data.

Reports which included student totals were generated at both the SEA and LEA levels. The totals showed data by district, grade, race, age, and school building. The reports generated detected any errors and also showed when errors were corrected. Validation reports were created to diminish errors of duplication of records or ineligibility. KSDE staff reviewed the database to ensure data was being entered accurately and in a timely manner.

(c) Data was collected on an ongoing basis. The KMSN is available for access by the LEA's at any time. Training sessions were conducted for the LEA's to instruct them on procedures for entering data and the requirements for doing so. Initial data was collected upon recruitment and completion of the COE. LEA's continually update data to ensure enrollment data, priority for service, and all pertinent data is current.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kansas Certificate of Eligibility Approval Team and districts are required to input data into the Kansas Migrant Student Network (KMSN). All users are provided User ID's and Passwords to access the KMSN. The KMSN menu and help files instruct them on how to navigate to the proper areas to input data in their students' records. The system saves the data to a database that generates reports and allows the district to re-access the data for updates or corrections. This system is web based and in real time so reports can be updated instantly. The data is organized through various ad hoc reports that the user can generate inputting certain parameters (e.g., dates, names, grades, enrollment types, etc.)

State MEP staff generate periodic reports which provide child counts for both categories 1 and 2 counts. The KMSN system is continually checked for duplication of records, data, etc.

<u>If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reports were created using SQL server 2005 database system and using structured query language. A parameter page was written using ASP pages to generate a report. The parameter page includes areas to input birth dates of children 3 through 21 years of age, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, withdrawal reasons and qualifying arrival dates within a 36 month period. Back up reports were created using Crystal reports for regular enrollment that have grids at the end of each report that summarize the student count after listing each student individually by grade, age, district, race, and school building.

Reports were created using SQL server 2005 database system and using structured query language. A parameter page was written using ASP pages to generate a report. The parameter page includes areas to input birth dates of children 3 through 21 years of age, residency only verification dates, withdrawal dates, withdrawal reasons and qualifying arrival dates within a 36 month period. Back up reports were created using Crystal reports for residency only students that have grids at the end of each report that summarize the student count after listing each student individually by grade, age, district, race, and school building.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Number of eligibility determinations sampled: 40

Number for which a test was completed: 40

Number found eligible: 40

This process guarantees that ineligible students are not formally included in the Migrant Education Program.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

completeness, as well as whether migrant projects are entering data in a timely manner.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State MEP office generated from the Kansas Migrant Student Network a Migrant Inactivity Report of students that may be eligible for the 2006-2007 counting period. LEAs reviewed the inactivity report to ensure that all migrant students were accounted for in generating the State's child count. The State MEP office in an effort to verify state child counts-initiated a statewide re-interview activity for the 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003 counting periods. Also, Kansas participated in the Initiative to Ensure Child Eligibility for the Title 1, Part C, Migrant Education Program for 2003-2004 directed by the Office of Migrant Education. As a result of these re-interviewing initiatives, Kansas amended its child counts for these counting periods. This verification of migrant eligibility contributed to accurate counts

of students for 2006-2007.

The Kansas State Department of Education shares the migrant data with each of its migrant projects and periodic verification of this data happens throughout each count period. This includes but is not limited to reminders of data entry deadlines, individual notices to projects to verify or correct information. Just prior to submitting the child count data to USDE, the KSDE conducts a last contct with projects in the form of otices and telephone conversations to remind them of: a) pending report deadlines; b) the need to verify that all data has been entered; c) to check that data has been correctly entered; and d) to aid in any problems that anyone may have in this process. A final review of the data is conducted by the migrant director and the data coordinator.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Corrective Action Continuum

As a result of the three phases of State revalidation,changes were made in the overall Kansas ID&R practices for all local projects.

Changes to the Kansas ID&R Process:

1.Revision of the Kansas ID&R Manual.

2.Redesigning required training and timeline for required training

for recruiters.

3.Develop a professional development schedule for local project

directors and recruiters to review and explain the MEP Non-regulator Guidance.

4.Establishing state policy on the flexibility of local recruiter

work schedules to accommodate the work schedules of migrant workers.

5.Establishing a Statewide Recruiter System.

6.Implementing a specific, ongoing technical assistance in the

area of ID&R for projects with excessive error rates.

7.Implementing increased accountability between local projects and

the state ID&R staff.

Corrective Actions:

The KSDE will implement three levels of corrective actions for projects demonstrating severe error rates. While Level One through Level Three do present a continuum of support provided to the local projects, corrective action taken with the local projects will not always start at Level One. Given the type of errors, the degree of inappropriate ID&R practices, and severity of the errors identified, the State may begin corrective action at Level Three.

Level One

? The ID&R Staff Development Specialist will contact the local

project director and establish a schedule of training for the project director and the recruiter. The training will occur one day per month and will include topics such as refreshing on the non-regulatory guidance, interview techniques, COE information, and eligibility criteria.

? The recruiter will keep daily time logs detailing activities

during scheduled work times.

? The State ID&R staff will review one COE submitted by the local

project out of each six submitted for content and eligibility determination.

? The training will continue for six months or until the local

project is able to hit the 98% confidence level for three consecutive months.

Level Two

? All the support activities provided in Level One will continue

in Level Two.

? The ID&R Staff Development Specialist will contact the local

project director to schedule two days of training per month. One day will continue with the topics above with the director and the recruiter.

On the second day, the ID&R Staff Development Specialist will accompany the recruiter on home visits to identify and recruit eligible migrant students. The first priority will be the COEs that have been returned by the State ID&R Staff for revalidation. The second priority will be

new family visits.

? The State ID&R Staff will review one COE submitted by the local

project out of each three submitted for content and eligibility determination.

? The training will continue for six months or until the local

project is able to hit the 98% confidence level for four consecutive months.

Level Three

? If after one full year of support provided by level one and two

activities, the project has not been able to maintain a 98% confidence level for four consecutive months, the state will deem Level Three corrective action is warranted. At this point, the State will take over the identification and recruitment for the local project.

? Given type of errors, the degree of inappropriate ID&R

practices, or severity of the errors identified, the State may deem it necessary to impose Level Three Corrective Action without first

implementing Level One or Two support. The State may immediately

assume the identification and recruitment for that local project.

? The State Director will convene a meeting with local school

district personnel, local migrant director, the recruiter, and State ID&R and COE review staff to determine a program of corrective action

plan specific to the circumstances in the district.

? Once a local project is put on Level Three Corrective Action,

this level of support will continue indefinitely.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns regarding the accuracy of the child counts in the CSPR. The data in table 1.10.1 is correct.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.