

**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 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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 Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 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: 07/31/2007

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, 2005-2006 Part II, 2005-2006

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): Dale Dennis

_____ Thursday, March 01, 2007, 5:32:48 PM
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

As mentioned in last year's Consolidated State Performance Report Part I, the Kansas State Board of Education approved the latest versions of the Kansas Science Education Standards on November 8, 2005 and again on February 14, 2006.

The following historical information is included in the current science standards:

Development of the Kansas Science Education Standards

The original Kansas Curricular Standards for Science was drafted in 1992, approved by the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE) in 1993, and updated in 1995. Although all of this work occurred prior to the release of the National Science Education Standards in 1996, the original Kansas standards reflect early work on the national standards.

At the August 1997 meeting of the Kansas State Board of Education, the Board directed that academic standards committees composed of stakeholders from throughout Kansas should be convened in each curriculum area defined by Kansas law (reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies). The 1998-2001 science standards committee was able to build upon and benefited from a great deal of prior work done on a national level; the National Science Education Standards published by the NRC; Benchmarks for Science Literacy from Project 2061 of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS); and Pathways to the Science Standards, published by the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA). This allowed the foundation for the Kansas Science Education Standards (2001) to be based on research and on the work of over 18,000 scientists, science educators, teachers, school administrators and parents across the country that produced national standards as well as the school district teams and thousands of individuals who contributed to the benchmarks. Kansas Curricular Standards for Science was approved by the Kansas State Board of Education on February 14, 2001.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

Kansas implemented new reading and mathematics assessments which met the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in 2005-2006. Assessments were administered in grades 3-8 and one grade in the high school.

The Kansas Assessment program is a program developed by the Kansas State Board of Education and is mandated by the Kansas Legislature. These assessments are important for the following reasons:

1. They provide measures of student achievement by means of tested indicators at grades 3-8 and high school.
2. They produce a building total score in reading, mathematics, science, history/government and writing to be used for Quality Performance Accreditation and are reported annually on the school and district's report cards.
3. Individual student scores along with individual performance levels are reported. Schools review the reading performance of individual students scoring at the "academic warning" proficiency level in conjunction with local reading indicators to determine whether the student needs an individual student improvement plan.
4. The subscale scores, along with the total score and other reported results, can be used in conjunction with local scores to assist in improving a school's or district's instructional program, planning curriculum or determining instructional and professional developmental emphasis.
5. The assessments are completed in grades 3-8 and once in high school between February 26th through April 20th. Once begun, testing is completed within a two-week period.

All students enrolled in the assessed grades are to participate in the appropriate state assessment(s). Participation includes all students with disabilities receiving special education services (i.e. students with IEPs). Students with disabilities take the assessment for the grade at which they are enrolled. No out of level (i.e. off grade level) assessments are allowed.

Students with disabilities have several assessment options. They may be eligible to participate in the general assessment, general assessment with accommodations, the Kansas Assessment of Modified Measures (KAMM), and the Kansas Alternate Assessment. Eligibility guidance has been developed and is available for students' IEP teams to determine the appropriate assessments. The decision of the IEP team regarding assessment type as well as any accommodations necessary must be documented on the IEP.

The two types of alternate assessments for students with disabilities are the KAMM and the KAA. The KAMM is an alternate assessment of grade level content standards judged against modified achievement standards. This assessment was first implemented in the spring of 2006 and will again be administered in the spring of 2007. The KAA is an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. The Kansas Extended Standards for reading, math, and writing were newly revised to better align with grade level standards. The Kansas State Board of Education approved the revisions in October of 2006. These Extended Standards will be used for the spring 2007 KAA with the testing window from January 2, 2007 through April 16, 2007.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

READING and MATHEMATICS

New state assessments were administered in 2006. Once the data from those assessments became available, the standard setting process began. Numerous teachers, content experts, assessment coordinators, and others participated in various standard setting processes in the summer of 2006. These included processes such as bookmark (judgmental) and contrasting groups (empirical). The committee's recommendations were submitted to a Super Panel for final consideration before being submitted to the Kansas State Board of Education. The State Board determined the final range of scores for each type of assessment.

SCIENCE

Establishing academic achievement standards for science will follow the same procedures as used with reading and mathematics. The will be set after the first administration in 2008.

ALTERNATE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In the summer of 2006, academic achievement standards for both the Kansas Assessment of Modified Measures (KAMM) and Kansas Alternate Assessment (KAA) in reading and math were established. Using data collected from the Spring 2006 KAMM administration, professionals from Kansas schools gathered from June 19-21, 2006 to participate in a bookmark procedure. Also, using the Spring 2006 data, special education professionals with expertise in working with students eligible for the KAA used a body of work method to develop recommendations on KAA achievement standards.

The recommendations made as a result of these standard-setting methods and assessment data for both KAMM and KAA were then reviewed by a panel of expert professionals on August 2, 2006. These expert panels made a final recommendation to KSDE on the achievement standards for these two assessments. These recommendations on cutpoints were reviewed and accepted by KSDE staff. The KAMM and KAA cutpoints were then presented to the Kansas State Board of Education at the same time as cutpoints for the general assessments and were accepted on August 8, 2006. The achievement standards will remain the same for the KAMM and KAA administration in the Spring 2007.

The achievement standards derived from the standards setting methods were approved.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include 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.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	239341	98.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	3538	97.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	5485	98.60
Black, non-Hispanic	20378	96.90
Hispanic	27656	97.60
White, non-Hispanic	176049	98.70
Students with Disabilities	32046	97.40
Limited English Proficient	15494	98.40
Economically Disadvantaged	95108	97.90
Migrant	2214	97.10
Male	123256	98.20
Female	116085	98.60

Comments: Multi-ethnic/Undeclared--Total number tested = 6235; Percent tested = 97.93

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	236246	98.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	3453	97.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	5521	96.30
Black, non-Hispanic	19932	97.00
Hispanic	26945	96.00
White, non-Hispanic	174242	98.70
Students with Disabilities	31490	97.30
Limited English Proficient	15228	94.50
Economically Disadvantaged	92697	97.40
Migrant	2151	96.20
Male	121575	98.00
Female	114671	98.40

Comments: Multi-Ethnic/Undeclared--Total number tested = 6153; percent tested = 97.65

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include 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.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	23256	72.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	5908	18.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2079	6.50

Comments: 3-1-2007 There is a data discrepancy between tables 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.2.1 which we are unable to resolve at this time.

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	22210	70.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	6268	19.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2203	7.00

Comments: 3-1-2007 There is a data discrepancy between tables 1.2.1.2 and 1.2.2.2 which we are unable to resolve at this time.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32293	80.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	438	77.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	836	84.20
Black, non-Hispanic	2707	61.40
Hispanic	4227	69.60
White, non-Hispanic	23060	85.30
Students with Disabilities	4373	67.60
Limited English Proficient	3024	65.90
Economically Disadvantaged	14313	72.40
Migrant	293	63.60
Male	16461	81.70
Female	15832	80.10

Comments: Multi-ethnic 1025 students tested; 78.6%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32165	78.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	436	75.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	817	75.90
Black, non-Hispanic	2707	60.80
Hispanic	4140	59.50
White, non-Hispanic	23042	84.40
Students with Disabilities	4357	64.90
Limited English Proficient	2909	51.70
Economically Disadvantaged	14207	68.20
Migrant	292	56.10
Male	16393	76.90
Female	15772	80.30

Comments: Multi-ethnic 1023 tested; 77.6%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32721	80.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	457	73.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	830	83.20
Black, non-Hispanic	2668	60.50
Hispanic	4043	67.30
White, non-Hispanic	23684	85.60
Students with Disabilities	4641	65.80
Limited English Proficient	2910	63.50
Economically Disadvantaged	13892	70.80
Migrant	272	70.20
Male	16772	81.20
Female	15949	80.40

Comments: Multi-ethnic 1039 students tested; 79%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32604	79.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	456	76.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	810	77.90
Black, non-Hispanic	2664	62.20
Hispanic	3965	59.90
White, non-Hispanic	23672	85.20
Students with Disabilities	4643	64.60
Limited English Proficient	2800	52.70
Economically Disadvantaged	13786	68.60
Migrant	265	49.40
Male	16723	78.20
Female	15881	81.10

Comments: Multi-ethnic 1037 tested; 77.3%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33023	78.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	511	75.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	739	85.50
Black, non-Hispanic	2756	59.80
Hispanic	3980	65.10
White, non-Hispanic	24071	83.30
Students with Disabilities	4606	61.80
Limited English Proficient	2590	59.90
Economically Disadvantaged	13762	68.60
Migrant	289	59.00
Male	16858	78.90
Female	16165	78.90

Comments: Multi-ethnic 966 tested; 78.1%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32930	77.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	512	75.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	722	80.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2756	59.70
Hispanic	3907	56.10
White, non-Hispanic	24065	82.40
Students with Disabilities	4600	60.10
Limited English Proficient	2497	46.50
Economically Disadvantaged	13681	65.10
Migrant	285	45.30
Male	16810	75.40
Female	16120	78.70

Comments: Multi-ethnic 968 tested; 76.6%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33390	74.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	520	67.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	758	81.40
Black, non-Hispanic	2993	49.20
Hispanic	3839	56.30
White, non-Hispanic	24382	80.60
Students with Disabilities	4446	52.00
Limited English Proficient	2099	48.90
Economically Disadvantaged	13538	60.40
Migrant	317	54.70
Male	17440	74.00
Female	15950	75.00

Comments: Multi-ethnic 898 tested; 70.7%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33345	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	520	74.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	745	78.20
Black, non-Hispanic	2995	56.00
Hispanic	3802	58.90
White, non-Hispanic	24390	84.10
Students with Disabilities	4457	58.40
Limited English Proficient	2032	47.30
Economically Disadvantaged	13507	64.70
Migrant	317	54.10
Male	17404	75.40
Female	15941	80.90

Comments: Multi-ethnic 893 tested; 72.7%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34113	70.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	509	61.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	749	80.10
Black, non-Hispanic	2901	46.30
Hispanic	3834	53.00
White, non-Hispanic	25309	75.80
Students with Disabilities	4454	45.40
Limited English Proficient	1850	44.80
Economically Disadvantaged	13427	56.50
Migrant	361	51.70
Male	17605	69.00
Female	16508	71.60

Comments: Multi-ethnic 811 tested; 63.2% b

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34021	79.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	509	71.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	728	80.60
Black, non-Hispanic	2896	59.00
Hispanic	3768	59.60
White, non-Hispanic	25313	84.80
Students with Disabilities	4452	56.50
Limited English Proficient	1758	44.40
Economically Disadvantaged	13353	66.20
Migrant	356	59.10
Male	17547	76.40
Female	16474	82.30

Comments: Multi-ethnic tested 807; 75.1%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	35126	66.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	504	55.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	736	78.50
Black, non-Hispanic	2956	42.40
Hispanic	3826	47.10
White, non-Hispanic	26383	72.20
Students with Disabilities	4606	40.90
Limited English Proficient	1636	37.40
Economically Disadvantaged	13335	51.40
Migrant	406	45.50
Male	18054	66.10
Female	17072	67.30

Comments: Multi-ethnic tested 721; 66.1%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	35081	77.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	70.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	726	75.80
Black, non-Hispanic	2954	57.50
Hispanic	3774	56.30
White, non-Hispanic	26403	83.10
Students with Disabilities	4618	52.90
Limited English Proficient	1560	38.00
Economically Disadvantaged	13287	63.50
Migrant	404	50.10
Male	18029	74.80
Female	17052	80.30

Comments: Multi-ethnic 717 tested; 76.1

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34855	58.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	509	44.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	759	68.10
Black, non-Hispanic	2762	30.40
Hispanic	3236	33.40
White, non-Hispanic	26941	64.80
Students with Disabilities	4069	30.70
Limited English Proficient	1139	25.20
Economically Disadvantaged	10800	39.70
Migrant	212	26.10
Male	17859	58.80
Female	16996	58.10

Comments: Multi-ethnic 648 tested; 48.4%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	31813	77.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	419	66.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	771	66.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2370	56.00
Hispanic	2522	53.40
White, non-Hispanic	25165	82.30
Students with Disabilities	3511	49.80
Limited English Proficient	833	29.80
Economically Disadvantaged	8505	61.70
Migrant	150	38.90
Male	16243	74.90
Female	15570	79.30

Comments: Multi-ethnic 566 tested; 70.5%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1408	1215	86.29

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	300	265	88.33

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	672	579	86.16

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	299	264	88.29

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Kansas continues to implement its Three Tier Model of Support in providing assistance to schools and districts identified for improvement. Level or Tier 1 is technical assistance for all schools and districts; Level or Tier 2 targets districts and schools on the watch list. Level or Tier 3 is primarily for districts and schools on improvement. High quality technical assistance and support is provided to Tier 3 through Instructional Support Teams (IST), previously known as District Support Teams.

Teams include individuals representing school improvement, special education and Title I. The teams meet with the districts and schools to assist them in analyzing data, completing self-assessments, developing improvement plans, and exploring strategies. The amount of assistance each team provides depends on the needs and the resources of the districts.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Kansas continues to implement its Three Tier Model of Support in providing assistance to schools and districts identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring. Tier 1 is technical assistance for all schools and districts; Tier 2 targets districts and schools on the watch list. Tier 3 is primarily for districts and schools on improvement. High quality technical assistance and support is provided to Tier 3 through Instructional Support Teams (IST), previously known as District Support Teams.

Teams include individuals representing school improvement, special education and Title I. The teams meet with the districts and schools to assist them in analyzing data, completing self-assessments, identifying root causes, developing improvement plans, and exploring strategies. The amount of assistance each team provides depends on the needs and the resources of the districts.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	14
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	18
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	471
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	7722
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	491
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	491
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	7
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	677
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2251
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	705
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	95870	87185	90.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	7303	6824	93.40
Low-Poverty Schools	7141	6827	95.60
All Elementary Schools	28220	26638	94.40
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	18748	15388	82.10
Low-Poverty Schools	21613	20386	94.30
All Secondary Schools	67650	60547	89.50
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	32.00
b) 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	31.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	37.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	16.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	7.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	41.00
d) Other (please explain)	36.00
Comments: Other (please explain): Secondary school classes taught by certified secondary teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test.	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	58.20	26.10
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch data is used to determine poverty.	
Secondary Schools	45.50	22.10
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch data is used to determine poverty.	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	100.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The Kansas English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Standards in April 2004. These standards were the foundation in the design of the Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA).

The Kansas ESOL Standards are posted on the Kansas State Department of Education's website. They have been distributed to Kansas districts. Numerous professional development activities on the standards continue to occur in individual districts, at educational service centers, and at the State ESOL/Migrant conference. These standards have been operationalized in districts with English Language Learners.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The process followed in developing the Kansas ESOL Standards ensured that they were closely linked to the academic content standards for reading, writing, mathematics and science. The Kansas State Department of Education reading consultant who facilitated the development of the content reading standards was actively involved in the development of the Kansas ESOL Standards to assist with aligning the standards. Moreover, the writing consultant at KSDE helped ensure that the ESOL writing standards were aligned to the State's 6-trait writing standards.

The format of the Kansas ESOL Standards is aligned with the format of the State's academic content standards by having standards, benchmarks and indicators per proficiency level and per grade level. In addition, the right side of the standards document contains instructional strategies that reflect what is expected in the academic content areas with modifications for English Language Learners.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

The Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA) was first administered in the Spring of 2005. The KELPA was developed to measure the English language proficiency of English Language Learners (ELL). All Kansas ELLs, grades K-12, were assessed in each of the four domains: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Comprehension was determined by calculating a weighted composite total score. Four levels of the KELPA were developed for the assessment of students withing specific grade level ranges: grades K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. Two forms of each grade level assessment were administered.

As a result of the considerable number of issues that arose with the first administration of the KELPA, a major revision of the KELPA was undertaken. The new KELPA was administered in 2005-2006; the issues were resolved. New grade band groupings occurred: K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8 and 9-12. Three forms of each grade level assessment were administered in Spring 2006.

As with all State assessments, there are specific prodedures undertaken to ensure that the technical quality of the assessment is of the highest standard. These same procedures were applied to the KELPA including a bias review and an outside review for rigor and content. An item analysis and alignment process were conducted following the first administration of the KELPA with the the results being incorporated into the revised KELPA. In addition, the different forms at each grade level are comparable and equitable. The Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE) at the University of Kansas is the developer of the KELPA.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2005-2006** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data													
2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State													
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
				Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (8)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
KELPA	26632	25995	97.60	3846	14.80	10235	39.40	8282	31.90	3632	14.00		
Totals	26632	25995	97.60	3846	14.80	10235	39.40	8282	31.90	3632	14.00		
Comments:													

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-8) In columns four-eight, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-8 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	23434	68.00
2. Vietnamese	1014	2.90
3. German	577	1.70
4. Lao	309	0.90
5. Chinese	276	0.80
6. Korean	252	0.70
7. Russian	154	0.50
8. Khmer/Cambodian	149	0.40
9. Phillipine	59	0.20
10. French	53	0.20
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data															
2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III															
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)		
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (7)				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
KELPA	25767	99.10	3815	14.80	10139	39.40	8216	31.90	3597	14.00					
Totals	25767	99.10	3815	14.80	10139	39.40	8216	31.90	3597	14.00					
Comments:															

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year.
- (3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
5436	4350	5

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

There hasn't been a large sudden influx; however, there has been a steady increase in Sudanese in one area of the state. In addition, some immigrants are moving to Kansas due to employment opportunities.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

The Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA) was significantly revised. As a result new cut scores were established in August 2006.

Scoring:

Each of the five grade-level KELPA assessments (K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12) are scored separately, with domain scores calculated for Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking, and a Composite (four domains combined, based on domain weightings). Committees of Kansas ESOL practitioners convened several times in the summer of 2006 to determine appropriate cut-scores for the KELPA domain and grade band assessments, under the guidance of the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE).

The weightings that each domain, per grade, constitute are defined as follows:

Domain K 1 2 3-5 6-12

Reading 15% 20% 25% 30% 30%

Writing 15% 20% 25% 30% 30%

Listening 35% 30% 25% 25% 30%

Speaking 35% 30% 25% 15% 10%

Total 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%

Cut scores for each of the four domains and the total score were determined by KSDE based on information gathered using school-based content experts' item judgments, teacher ratings of student classroom performance, student performance on the state's general assessment tests, and the recommendations of teachers, curriculum directors, and principals reviewing these data. The Kansas State Board of Education approved the cut scores for each performance level in August 2006.

The following tables detail the cut-scores used to classify students into Performance Level categories for each of the four domains and total score for all grade levels.

Reading Domain Performance Level Cut Scores:

Grade Beginning Intermediate Advanced Fluent

K 0-21 22-45 46-64 65-100

1 0-64 65-84 85-94 95-100

2 0-29 30-54 55-74 75-100

3 0-35 36-62 63-83 84-100

4-5 0-44 45-71 72-86 87-100

6-8 0-46 47-76 77-90 91-100

9-12 0-48 49-75 76-89 90-100

Writing Domain Performance Level Cut scores:

Grade Beginning Intermediate Advanced Fluent

K 0-30 31-49 50-59 60-100

1 0-59 60-81 82-94 95-100

2 0-40 41-63 64-76 77-100

3 0-44 45-67 68-81 82-100

4-5 0-55 56-74 75-85 86-100

6-8 0-51 52-73 74-85 86-100

9-12 0-52 53-75 76-87 88-100

Listening Domain Performance Level Cut scores:

Grade Beginning Intermediate Advanced Fluent

K 0-43 44-64 65-77 78-100

1 0-55 56-77 78-99 91-100

2 0-53 54-81 82-90 91-100

3 0-60 61-83 84-93 84-100

4-5 0-53 54-76 77-89 90-100

6-8 0-50 51-78 79-90 91-100

9-12 0-41 42-72 73-86 87-100

Speaking Domain Performance Level Cut scores:

Grade Beginning Intermediate Advanced Fluent

K 0-24 25-52 53-69 70-100

1 0-45 46-70 71-88 89-100

2 0-55 56-76 77-88 89-100

3 0-59 60-79 80-92 93-100

4-5 0-64 65-82 83-95 96-100

6-8 0-61 62-84 85-97 98-100

9-12 0-59 60-84 85-97 98-100

Composite (Total) Performance Level Cut scores:

Grade Beginning Intermediate Advanced Fluent

K 0-38 39-54 55-68 69-100

1 0-57 58-77 78-87 88-100

2 0-49 50-66 67-79 80-100

3 0-51 52-70 71-82 83-100

4-5 0-56 57-74 75-84 85-100

6-8 0-53 54-76 77-87 88-100

9-12 0-50 51-75 76-85 86-100

These cut scores were approved by the Kansas State Board of Education on August 8, 2006.

A committee of Kansas ESOL practitioners representing LEAs, both rural and urban, KSDE, universities, and psychometricians convened to advise KSDE on reasonable Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives, based on KELPA's baseline data (Spring 2006) and the approved cut-scores.

The committee's consensus of the definition of "proficient", based on KELPA, is:

"A student with a composite score of "fluent" (4), with no domain score (listening, speaking, reading, or writing) of less than "advanced" (3).

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

Kansas administered a significantly revised English language proficiency assessment in 2005-2006. The results from the 2005 pilot are not able to be compared to the 2006 test. Thus until the assessment is administered a second time, there is not true measure of "making progress." For that reason, the definition of "making progress" is "A student who scores in the beginning, intermediate, or advanced levels of the KELPA 2006."

Refer to 1.6.5 for the ranges of each proficiency level.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The definition of cohort remains the same in terms of grade spans: K-3, 4-8 and 9-12. The length of time in an ESL program is being added to the cohort definition: 0-2 years, 2-5 years, and over 5 years.

K-3: 0-2 years (short term)

K-3: 2-5 years (typical)

K-3: >5 years (long term)

4-8: 0-2 years (short term)

4-8: 2-5 years (typical)

4-8: >5 years (long term)

9-12: 0-2 years (short term)

9-12: 2-5 years (typical)

9-12: >5 years (long term)

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 20.00	# 5475	% 89.60	# 23295	% 15.00	# 4106	% 10.40	# 2700

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	20.00	23091	89.60
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		0	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	15.00	2676	10.40
TOTAL		25767	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	429	78.90
4	341	78.40
5	378	69.50
6	429	66.90
7	372	73.80
8	249	63.80
H.S.	137	58.30

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	454	83.50
4	351	80.70
5	413	75.90
6	439	68.50
7	329	65.30
8	221	56.70
H.S.	131	40.20

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	90.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.30
Black, non-Hispanic	83.10
Hispanic	79.00
White, non-Hispanic	92.10
Students with Disabilities	87.20
Limited English Proficient	76.60
Economically Disadvantaged	83.90
Migrant	79.00
Male	88.60
Female	91.90
Comments: Multi-Ethnic 88.56%	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	1.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2.50
Hispanic	2.50
White, non-Hispanic	1.20
Students with Disabilities	1.50
Limited English Proficient	2.30
Economically Disadvantaged	1.40
Migrant	1.80
Male	1.70
Female	1.20
Comments: Multi-Ethnic 1.59%	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

Kansas defines a school year as a period of 12 months ending June 30th (July 1-June 30). Students in grades K-11 are to attend no less than 186 days and those in grade 12, no less than 181 days. Should a district adopt a policy of hours attended, kindergarten students must attend no less than 465 hours; students in grades 1-11 no less than 1116 school hours; and students in grade 12, no less than 1086 school hours.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	292	292
LEAs with Subgrants	7	7

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	147	163
1	141	192
2	128	150
3	133	150
4	115	136
5	110	129
6	69	127
7	89	125
8	79	106
9	92	113
10	84	118
11	73	102
12	86	107

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	165	822
Doubled-up	898	678
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	21	36
Hotels/Motels	100	94
Unknown	162	88

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	150
1	177
2	138
3	129
4	127
5	115
6	117
7	115
8	92
9	97
10	74
11	63
12	43

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

515

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

103

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

76

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	200
English Language Learners (ELL)	79
Gifted and Talented	< n
Vocational Education	20

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	6
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	6
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	7
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional)	

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	1

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Legal guardianship for youth	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	44	30
Grade 4	Yes	27	17
Grade 5	Yes	49	27
Grade 6	Yes	34	22
Grade 7	Yes	40	26
Grade 8	Yes	35	23
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	17	< n
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	45	33
Grade 4	Yes	30	17
Grade 5	Yes	48	30
Grade 6	Yes	34	18
Grade 7	Yes	38	23
Grade 8	Yes	36	23
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	11	< n
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.