d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:

☒ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or

☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or

☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

ii. <u>Minimum N-Size</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))*:

a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

Kansas will use a minimum N size of 30 for inclusion in the accountability calculations under section 1111(c) for all students and each subgroup of students.

b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

During No Child Left Behind (NCLB) implementation, the KSDE convened a group of the KSDE staff and technical advisors including the State's assessment contractor, the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE). CETE recommended a minimum subgroup size of 30. Anything smaller than 30 would lead to large numbers of subgroups being misidentified as high or low performers simply due to chance, not performance. As subgroup size diminishes, the variance of the subgroup's test measure increases, making any pronouncement about the subgroup's performance less and less reliable. At sizes below 30, the KSDE would be identifying some subgroups as high performing, and some as low performing, but many, maybe most, would be the result of chance, not performance. The ongoing process of consulting with technical advisors, as well as reviewing longitudinal data, provide the KSDE with confidence that 30 is a valid and reliable n-size for identifying under- performing subgroups for accountability. Subgroups for accountability include economically disadvantaged students from each major racial and ethnic group, students with disabilities and English Learners.

c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

The KSDE consulted with various constituency groups, including the Kansas Assessment Advisory Council, Kansas Technical Advisory Council, CETE, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Advisory Council, consisting of educators, students, parents and, families, including representation from the Kansas Parent Information Center and Families Together. This broad group of technical experts and the KSDE leadership agreed that the subgroup size of 30 was the appropriate n-size for Kansas.

The ongoing process of consulting with technical advisors and stakeholders, as well as reviewing longitudinal data, provide the KSDE with confidence that 30 is a valid and reliable n-size for identifying underperforming subgroups for accountability.

d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.

Kansas follows Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act guidelines, the General Education Provisions Act guidelines and Kansas State Statute 72-6215, Student Data Privacy Act. Kansas' threshold for reporting student data is 10, which is 1/3 the size of its minimum subgroup size for determining subgroup performance for accountability. To protect the identities of students, publicly displayed student-level data with cell size of less than 10 is not reported.

e. If the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

Kansas will use a minimum N size of 10 for inclusion in public reporting under section 1111(h) for all students and each subgroup of students. The minimum number of students respects privacy and is statistically reliable.

iii. <u>Establishment of Long-Term Goals</u> *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))*:

a. <u>Academic Achievement</u>.

1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

The KSDE will use an academic measurement of proficiency to summarize state, district, and subgroup performance across all performance categories, as stated by ESEA subsection (b)(2)(B)(v)(I): "...annually measure, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, the following indicators:
(i) For all public schools in the State, based on the long-term goals established under subparagraph (A), academic achievement – (I) <u>as measured by proficiency</u> on the annual assessment required under subsection (b)(2)(B)(v)(I)..." The KSDE will report on district dashboards at state, district, and school levels the percent of students scoring in each performance category by assessment subject, grade level, and subgroup.

Academic Measure of Proficiency Long-term Goal for All students:

At the state, district, school and subgroup level, 75 percent of students score in performance levels 3 and 4 combined on the Kansas state assessments in English language arts and mathematics by 2030.

The same long-term goal of 75 percent proficiency will be applied to each subgroup and, as a result, those groups with the greatest percent at Kansas performance levels 1 and 2 (not proficient) will require interim measures of progress that are greater than other subgroups in order to make significant gain and close gaps. This rigorous goal was chosen through a collaborative process that included reviewing assessment studies and cut scores. Kansas established a

14