

# **STATE OF KANSAS**

**Application for State Grant  
under the  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program  
Title IV, Part B of the  
Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
As amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001  
(Pub.L.107-110).**

*Submitted to:*  
U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
*Submitted by:*  
Kansas State Department of Education  
May 31, 2002

## **Section 1: Use of Administrative Funds**

**1.1 Contact Person:** Ruth Mott, Education Program Consultant, State and Federal Programs, Kansas State Department of Education.

This application will describe how Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) (using its own staff and with the contractual help of the University of Kansas School of Education Institute for Educational Research and Public Service ( IERPS)) will manage and administer the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program. A small portion of State administration funds will be consolidated with other administrative funds available from ESEA programs. The State of Kansas has not been awarded State-Flex status by the U.S. Department of Education, and has not requested any waivers of certain other 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC statutory requirements.

**1.2 Describe the process the State educational agency used to develop its application requirements. Include the list of agencies, officials, and individuals with whom the State consulted and coordinated for advice and guidance.**

The Kansas State Department of Education hereby provides assurance that the State application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the chief State school officer, other State agencies administering before- and after-school (or summer school) programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations, including faith-based organizations. The communications described below illustrate the extent of the consultation and coordination, and the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board roster, included in this section, outlines the roles of its members.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) formed a Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Application Planning Team to oversee the collaborative planning process. Team members were led by Judi Miller, KSDE Coordinator of State and Federal Programs (who also serves as Title I Coordinator and Comprehensive School Reform Coordinator for KSDE). Other Planning Team members include Ruth Mott, KSDE Education Program Consultant, who will serve as the contact person and will be responsible for the administration and supervision of Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs; Nancy Harper, Assistant Director of the University of Kansas Institute for Educational Research and Public Service (IERPS), who will manage the contract on behalf of

KSDE and will lead the technical-assistance effort; Jerry Bailey, IERPS Director; Carolyn Williams, Program Officer of the Kansas Health Foundation, sponsor of the Kansas First Team, the group that has provided technical assistance to the 52 school districts in Kansas with current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grants; and Deb Elder, president of the Kansas Community Education Association (KSCEA) and former 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Project Director.

Before the formation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board, the Planning Team consulted regularly with Kansas Commissioner of Education Andy Tompkins (Chief State School Officer) and Assistant Commissioner Alexa Pochowski. Planning Team members have undertaken a series of activities to meet the letter and spirit of information-dissemination, idea-gathering, and collaboration described in Section 1.2. Those activities include (but are not limited to) the following:

**\* Attended conferences to learn about and plan for the transition;**

- \* National Community Education Association, Charleston, November, 2001.
- \* “Keeping the Vision” Council of Chief State School Officers, Tampa, Nov. 28-20, 2001.
- \* “Transitions: Public-Private Partnerships and After-school Legislation,” C.S. Mott Foundation, Sacramento, Jan 29-30, 2002.
- \* Mott Foundation/NCCE Trainers workshop and US Department of Education Listening Session, Kansas City, February, 2002.
- “Achieving the Vision,” Council of Chief State School Officers, Houston, April 10-11, 2002.

**\* Sponsored or presented information sessions at regional and statewide conferences**

- \* Kansas First (Kansas Health Foundation) Fall Workshop, Wichita, 2001.
- \* NCCE Midwest Region Training Conference, Kansas City, April 11-12, 2002.
- \* Kansas Community Education Association conference, Topeka, April 27-28, 2002.
- \* Southeast Kansas Regional Education Service Center, Girard, April, 2002.
- \* Kansas state-wide ESEA Technical-Assistance Workshops, March-April, 2002, held at Girard, Colby, Lawrence, Salina, Garden City, and Wichita.

**\* Conducted survey of current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Project Directors;**

Project Directors of 52 current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in Kansas regularly share advice and ideas through the Kansas First Team listserv. Using that tool, the team conducted a survey (March 28, 2002) to generate comments on eight questions related to elements of the Kansas Application. Those Project Directors’ suggestions are embedded in the Application.

**\* Organized and facilitated meetings of statewide 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board;**

The statewide 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board includes many members who have experience with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. Those individuals served on an advisory board called together by the Kansas Health Foundation, in 2000, to coordinate resources for the existing extended-day programs in the state. These “holdover” members join others to make up the current Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board, a roster of which appears on the pages following. The purpose of the group is to allow agencies and organizations to share information on existing resources for training and technical assistance, to avoid duplication of services, and to disseminate information about the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program to a wider audience. During its first meeting, (April 17, 2002), the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board learned about the status quo and transition of the program in Kansas, and began the process of sharing information, especially on training and funding resources. Other meetings have been and will be held electronically, or *in situ*.

**\* Initiated separate meetings with the state-agency leaders who are most likely to collaborate directly,** including leaders of the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA), Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services (SRS), and Office of the Kansas Attorney General. In meeting with the Child Care Licensing Department of KDHE, for example, the team learned of new licensing regulations that will apply to schools and to private child-care establishments, and of KDHE training available for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC staff. These meetings also solidified the resources- and funds-sharing relationships available among the state agencies.

<b>Kansas 21st Century Community Learning Center Advisory Board (KSDE)</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Category</b>
Joe Meyers Director of Human Resources	Spring Hill USD 230 School District	21st CCLC Site
Mim Wilkey, Director Youth Services	Wichita YMCA	CBO
Gary Brunk, Executive Director	Kansas Action for Children	Private Non-Profit
Hon. Kathryn Carter 12 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	Judge, Juvenile Court & Concordia 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Adv. Bd. Member	21st CCLC Advisory Board & Judicial Officer
Ron Miller, Dir. of Prevention	Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA)	State Agency
Sandy Christianson,	Grants Coordinator - JJA	State Agency
Diana Carkin Dir. of Child Services	Topeka YMCA	CBO
Angela Henry, Project Director & AA Ambassador	Iola 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC "SafeBase" & Kansas Afterschool Alliance Ambassador	National Partner-Afterschool Alliance Parent
Dee Hansen Fine Arts Consultant	KS Department of Education	Arts Education/State Agency
Connie Burket Executive Director	KS Alliance for Arts Education	State-wide Arts Agency
Clay Abla Admin. Assistant	Elkhart 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC	Consolidated State Ed Programs
Richard Smith Asst. Attorney General	Office of the Kansas Attorney General	State Agency
Ruth Mott Programs Consultant	KS Department of Education	SEA Contact
Dan Thornton Director	NW KS Education Service Center	Regional Education Agency
Janine Gracy Director	Regional Prevention Center-Olathe	Health Prevention
Alice Womack Administrator	Kansas Dept. of Social and Rehabilitative Services: Childcare and Early Childhood Development	State Agency Administering Before and After School Programs
Joe Wrobel Director	Shawnee Parks and Recreation (Topeka)	Youth Programs
Janet Waugh Vice President	Kansas State Board of Education	Elected State education policy board member
Brad Kirmer Program Consultant II	KDHE Mental Health	Designee of Head of State Mental Health Agency
Carolyn Williams Program Officer	Kansas Health Foundation	Private Foundation
Margo Quiriconi Program Officer	Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation	Private Foundation

Dr. Larry Dixon Asst. Superintendent	Geary County USD 475 21st CCLC	K-12 Administration
Lynn Thrall, Principal, Elkhart Elementary School	Elkhart USD 218, 21st CCLC	Elementary Principal
Ken Gentry, former Team Leader for Federal and State Programs	Kansas Department of Education	State Government/Education
Rev. Karl Harman, Pastor	First Baptist Church, and Advisory Board of Wellington USD 353 21st CCLC	Faith-Based Community
Wayne Harader, Chairman	Wellington USD 353 21st CCLC Advisory Board and active 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC academic tutor (math/science)	Volunteer Retired business owner
Chris Ross Blaze Dir. of Child Care Licensing	KSDE Child Care Licensing Kansas Dept of Health and Environment	Representing the Head of State Health Agency
Debra Mikulka Director	Chanute USD 413 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC	21st CCLC Sites
Lonnie Vopat Elementary Teacher	Spring Hill USE 230 21st CCLC	K-12 Teacher
Ron Fagan, Superintendent	Wellington USD 353	K-12 District Administrator
Howard Pitler Principal	Brooks Middle School Wichita USD 259	K-12 Principal
Nancy Harper Assistant Director	KU Institute for Educational Research & Public Service	Advisory Board Facilitator
Deb Elder, President & Program Assistant	Kansas Community Education Association & KU Institute for Educational Research & Public Service	Advisory Board Facilitator

### 1.3 Describe the results of the State’s needs and resources assessment for before- and after-school activities, which shall be the basis for ongoing State evaluation activities.

The Assessment of Needs and Resources for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in Kansas includes many data sets, described below with boldface headings. As the priorities for the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will limit awards to projects primarily serving students who attend Title I Schoolwide (or equivalent) schools, the Needs section of this application centers on those schools. The chart below shows that 118 schools currently are on Improvement status.

#### **Percent and number of Title I schools on School Improvement:**

<b>Kansas Title I: District/Schools on Improvement 2001-2002 (KSDE)</b>		
<i>Year</i>	<i>Districts on Improvement</i>	<i>Schools on Improvement</i>
1997-1998	73	143
1998-1999	81	154
1999-2000	57	142
2000-2001	45	132
2001-2002	31	118
<b>Corrective Action</b>		
2000-2001	0	67
2001-2002	21	50

#### **Unified School Districts eligible for “Reading First.”**

Among the 27 school districts eligible for Reading First, an average of 51.37 percent of students are not reading on grade level.

#### **ESEA funds used for Extended Day Programs in Kansas.**

<b>Funds used in Kansas Unified School Districts’ Extended-day Programs: 2001-02 (KSDE)</b>						
	<i>Before School</i>	<i>Evenings</i>	<i>Extended Day</i>	<i>Extended Year</i>	<i>Summer School</i>	<i>Weekends</i>
Title I	97	1	1	19	102	5
Title II	53	1	0	15	20	12
Title IV	61	1	0	8	10	12
Title VI	57	1	0	11	31	3
At-Risk	198	2	2	38	134	18
Migrant	14	1	1	8	25	5
ESOL/BE	11	1	0	5	18	0
<i>May, 2002: 304 Unified School Districts in Kansas (KSDE)</i>						

#### **Kansas high-school graduation records.**

In 1998, 85 percent of 18- to 24-year-olds across the nation had completed high school or its equivalent. During 1999, Kansas fell short of this national graduation rate with a state rate of 81.8 percent. In that year, a full 73 percent of Kansas counties achieved graduation rates of 85 percent or higher. One county had a state low of 58 percent in 1999. Rates are calculated by dividing the number of graduates by the sum of graduates and dropouts from grades nine through 12. (*Kansas Action for Children, Inc. 2001*)

### **Comparison of positive and negative change in selected measures over six years.**

. The 304 unified school districts in Kansas do not follow county lines. However, most data gathering concentrates on the 105 counties as the unit of measure. Therefore, many data sets do not precisely describe the USD. With that caveat, this comparison centers on change over six years in the 61 Kansas counties in which Title I Schoolwide sites (designated or intent to file) are located. A comparison of statistics from Kansas Action for Children and KSDE of the years 1996-2000 vs. 2001 show the following need in the 61 counties:

- 1 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC applications not funded: During the 2001 round of awards, applications were denied from communities in 24 of the 61 Schoolwide counties in this comparison. The need for those programs still exists. Furthermore, applications for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program extensions in 11 of the 61 counties also were denied. Current or ended 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs are funded in 29 of the 61 counties.
- 2 Juvenile Court filings percent increase: When looking at juvenile filing rates among different counties, the deviant behavior of youth that leads to a juvenile court filing in one jurisdiction may not necessarily result in a court filing in another (*Kansas Kids Count Data Book 2001*). However, during the comparison period in the 61 counties, records show that 25 of the 61 counties report increases in juvenile court filings. The average is 36.9 percent increase.
- 3 Children approved for Free school meals increase: In 30 of the 61 counties, records show an increase of students qualified to receive free school meals. The average is 7.2 percent increase among the 30 counties.
- 4 Births to single teens percent increase: 25 of the 61 counties showed an increase during the reporting period.
- 5 Child care availability percent decrease: 23 of the 61 counties lost an average of 10.2 percent of Child Care Availability during the comparison period. The range among the counties affected is -1 to -33%.

### **Kansas State Assessments explanation and baseline data.**

At this time, the Kansas Assessments are constructed to provide input and assist with understanding a student's achievement with reference to the Kansas subject area Curriculum Standards and to inform officials as to the performance of schools toward achieving these Standards. Any other use, action or inference based on performance on the Kansas assessments was not considered during the development of the assessments. Furthermore, the state assessments are not used by other states, thus a direct comparison to how others do on the Kansas examinations is not possible. Efforts are underway to join other state programs to afford some degree of comparative evaluation.

Five assessments comprise the Kansas Assessments: Mathematics, administered annually at grades 4, 7, and 10; Reading, administered annually at grades 3, 7, and 10; Writing, administered in even-numbered fiscal years at grades 5, 8, and 10 or at adjacent grade levels when requested by the district and approved by KSBE; Science, administered in the fall of odd-numbered fiscal years at grades 5, 8, and 10; and Social Studies, administered in odd-numbered fiscal years at grades 5, 8, and 11. Thus, as the Kansas Assessments are not administered

annually to the same individual students, they do not at this time provide baseline data usable as the sole evaluation tool of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

As the baseline is not yet established, the targets for annual criteria will not be set until May, 2003. After that time, the Kansas Assessments may be used as performance indicators in reading and mathematics for the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs, to show the percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts and mathematics on the State's assessment.

### **Kansas Persistently Dangerous Schools**

Annually, Kansas' schools report statistics on violence against students and against teachers. However, Kansas has not defined Persistently Dangerous Schools. Baseline data will be provided for the 2002-03 year.

### **Kansas compared to U.S. in selected demographic measures.**

<b>Selected demographics: All Kansas Students (2000 under 18 = 712,993)</b>			
<i>Item</i>	<i>Kansas %</i>	<i>US %</i>	<i>Source</i>
Race: White	77%	61%	US Census 2000: Kids Count
Race: Black	7%	15%	"
Race: Asian/Pacific Isl.	2%	3%	"
Race: American Indian	1%	1%	"
Race Hispanic	10%	17%	"
Race: Some other	.05%	.05%	"
Race: More than one	3%	3%	"
Juvenile Court filings/1000	24.4	21.3	2001 Kansas Kids Count, Kids Count 2001
Children in extreme poverty	6%	8%	2001 Kansas Kids Count
Rate of teen (15-17) death by accident, homicide, suicide /100,000	68	54	1998. Kids Count 2001
Female head of family receives child support	52%	34%	2001 Kansas Kids Count
4 <sup>th</sup> grade below basic reading	29%	39%	2001 Kansas Kids Count
8 <sup>th</sup> grade below basic reading	19%	28%	2001 Kansas Kids Count

The following performance goals and indicators stand as the framework for KSDE's evaluation of Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs. Their inclusion is based upon ESEA Goals and Indicators, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC statutory requirements, advisory board advice, best-practices suggestions from NCREL, and others.

## **Performance Goals and Indicators: Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Program**

### **Part I: ESEA Goals, Indicators, State Performance Targets**

#### **Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**

1.1 Performance indicator: In each year of the granted program, the percentage of students enrolled in the program who are exposed to a wide array of educational, recreational, career, and cultural opportunities and activities.

1.1.1 *Performance target: 100 percent of enrolled students will be exposed to a wide array of educational, recreational, career, and cultural opportunities and activities.*

1.2 Performance indicator: In each year of the granted program, the percentage of students enrolled in the program who receive day-school grade cards at the end of every term.

1.2.1 *Performance target: 80 percent of the program-enrolled K-12 participants will maintain high academic achievement and/or demonstrate continuous improvement in mathematics and reading.*

1.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who are offered tutoring support in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

1.3.1 *Performance target: 100 percent of the program-enrolled K-12 participants will be offered tutoring support.*

1.4 Performance indicator: The percentage of K-12 participants whose day teachers report increased rates of homework completion among their students who attend the program and who are assigned homework.

1.4.1 *Performance target: Day teachers of 60 percent of K-12 participants who are assigned homework will report increased rates of homework completion among their students who attend the program.*

1.5 Performance indicator: The percentage of K-12 participants who participate in activities integrating real-life problem solving, arts education, and service learning.

1.5.1 *Performance target: 90 percent of K-12 participants will participate in activities integrating real-life problem solving, arts education, and service learning.*

1.6 Performance indicator: The percentage of K-12 participants enrolled in the program whose families/guardians are offered a variety of services and educational resources.

1.6.1 *Performance target: A variety of services and educational resources will be offered to the families/guardians of 100% of K-12 program participants.*

#### **Performance Goal 2: All students will graduate from high school.**

2.1 Performance indicator: In each year of the granted program, the percentage of students enrolled in the program who are exposed to a wide array of educational, career, and cultural opportunities and activities.

2.1.1 *Performance target: 100 percent of enrolled students will be exposed to a wide array of educational, career, and cultural opportunities and activities.*

2.2 Performance indicator: In each year of the granted program, the percentage of students enrolled in the program who are suspended (in-school or out-of-school).

*2.2.1 Performance target: 90 percent of participants will not be suspended (in-school or out-of-school) while in the program.*

2.3 Performance indicator: In each year of the granted program, the percentage of students enrolled in the program who participate in activities integrating real-life problem solving, arts education, career planning, and service learning.

*2.3.1 Performance target: 90 percent of K-12 students enrolled in the program will participate in activities integrating: real-life problem solving, arts education, career planning, and service learning.*

2.4 Performance indicator: In each year of the granted program, the percentage of students enrolled in the program who are found to have engaged in violent acts at school.

*2.4.1 Performance target: 80 percent of program-enrolled K-12 participants will not be found to have engaged in violent acts at school.*

**1.4 Describe how the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs will be coordinated with ESEA programs and other programs as appropriate.**

A. Identify and describe collaboration potential with existing programs and agencies.

While applicants for a Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant are not required to utilize all of the ESEA-program funds described below, each applicant will be encouraged to make best and most effective use of ESEA funds and to provide assurances of such collaboration in the application. Currently, many school districts in Kansas use the funds listed below in extended-day programs; the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will encourage applicants to expand the list.

<b>Funds used in Kansas Unified School Districts' Extended-day Programs: 2001-02 (KSDE)</b>						
	<i>Before School</i>	<i>Evenings</i>	<i>Extended Day</i>	<i>Extended Year</i>	<i>Summer School</i>	<i>Weekends</i>
Title I	97	1	1	19	102	5
Title II	53	1	0	15	20	12
Title IV	61	1	0	8	10	12
Title VI	57	1	0	11	31	3
At-Risk	198	2	2	38	134	18
Migrant	14	1	1	8	25	5
ESOL/BE	11	1	0	5	18	0
<i>May, 2002: 304 Unified School Districts in Kansas (KSDE)</i>						

Agencies throughout the Kansas government acknowledge that collaboration promotes efficient, non-duplicative uses of funds and human energy. The opportunity to collaborate on the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC project will solidify the collaborative efforts undertaken to date, and initiate others that are now in the planning stages. Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC liaison, Ruth Mott, is a member of the KSDE State and Federal Programs team and currently works with all state and federal programs in the consolidated plan in active collaboration with other programs.

Early childhood stakeholders, for example, have a history of working in collaboration. According to the Director of Child Care Licensing for KDHE, several agencies have worked together on specific projects, which have been initiated by one or more of the collaborating agencies. Those agencies include JJA, KDHE (Child Care Subsidy and Child Care Licensing), the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services' (SRS) Child Care and Early Childhood Development section, and KSDE. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC projects will extend that collaboration.

In fact, the statute encourages coordination. There is substantial evidence of collaboration among KDHE and migrant programs, USDA (meals/snacks), Workforce Investment, Americorps, TANF, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act projects, Parents as

Teachers (housed with KSDE state and federal program team), and others. In Kansas, substantial collaboration has occurred already.

Typically, Title I monies fund regular-day school teachers, paraprofessionals and teachers' aides who work with children with below-grade-level academic achievement in math and reading. The new legislation specifically encourages Title I use in extended-day programs to minimize pull-out during the school day. If used in extended-day programs, Title I funds could provide more individualized academic support and, with active collaboration among service-providers, could address learning barriers (such as family or social issues) that lie beyond academic-specific. Addressing all the academic barriers to success will make more efficient and effective use of Title I funds.

In 2000-01, 194 schools in Kansas qualified for Schoolwide Title I, and 58 filed a formal intent to apply for that designation. Superintendents in districts with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs are being encouraged to investigate the use of Title I funds in the extended-day programs. 21<sup>st</sup> sites that meet criteria could become KSDE-approved, supplemental-educational service providers as defined in the legislation. Title I funds, for example, may be used in concert with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds to provide extended learning programs that provide integrated academic enrichment for students and their families

Title II (Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teacher and Principals) funds could be used in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs to place promising academic leaders in Site Coordinator positions with the intention of providing administrative training for future principals. Furthermore, after-school staff could be included in professional development that is funded by Title II.

Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students). Title III funds will be especially useful for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in a surprising number of Kansas communities, especially in the far western part of the State. In these areas (Elkhart, Garden City, Liberal, and others), large numbers of immigrant families have altered the community demographics as they come to work in feed-lot and meat-packing industries. In these current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs, translation, instruction, signage, and communication with families is an important consideration for the program's success. Furthermore, Title III funds could help target the message and the language for parent education.

Title IV: A. Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities.

All Kansas School Districts received Title IV funds. Many have relinquished these small pools of money to education service centers. The later may provide services with larger pools of money to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs.

B. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools. In Kansas, 52 school districts have been awarded 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grants since the program began. The program has spawned a public/private collaboration to provide technical assistance to all 52 districts: The Kansas Health Foundation has funded a technical-assistance team entitled the Kansas First Team, which has sponsored three or four annual, statewide workshops for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC project training.

Title V-A. Innovative Programs. Title V-A funds can provide the resources to address and solve current educational needs, especially in the area of academic achievement, by funding professional development, activities to advance student achievement, drop-out prevention, and many other needs. These funds hold promise for collaborative use of ESEA funds with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs, especially to support innovative reading, parent education, character education, service learning, school safety programs, and other academic-achievement and school-improvement activities.

Title VI: Flexibility and Accountability. Title VI provides “Increased Flexibility,” giving participating LEAs flexibility by authorizing them to consolidate a portion of their allocations under the Teacher Quality, Innovative Programs, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Educational Technology, and other programs. The rural education plan, REAP, allows additional flexibility to the 160 qualifying school districts. These districts have an average daily attendance of fewer than 600 or serve only schools located in counties with a population density of fewer than 10 person per square miles.

Title VII: Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education. Demographics (*Kids Count Data Book, 2001*) show that 0.9% of Kansans under age 18 are American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut. In Brown County (northeast Kansas), the American Indian youth population is 6.4%, for example. USDE administers these funds.

Title IX provides regulatory guidance but no funds.

Migrant Programs: In Kansas, 25 schools districts use migrant funds in their summer schools programs and 16 use these funds in extended day programs. Current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs (including Elkhart, Liberal and Garden City) coordinate the family and student-service needs of migrant students. The University of Kansas administers CAMP at KU (College

Assistance Migrant Program), in close collaboration with existing 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in the state. In Elkhart's 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, for example, the supervisor of migrant education also plans and directs the parent education programs.

USDA (snacks): KSDE Nutrition Services Department administers these funds on behalf of USDA, reimbursing school districts (and 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs) for the school-lunch programs and, for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs, for before- and after-school and summer program snacks.

Workforce Investment: Regional Workforce boards exist in five Kansas areas, many of which are located in communities with existing 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grants. In each designated area, the Workforce Network of Kansas includes a Local Elected Official Board, an Investment Board, and a Youth Council. Network members in each area will be apprised of the RFP, and applicants will be apprised of the Workforce Investment network.

Americorps: A number of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in Kansas have taken advantage of the services of Americorps college students in their areas. While few students currently are employed in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC projects through this program, we envision much more collaboration among the Americorps directors at Kansas colleges, universities, and community colleges to increase participation level. Transportation and travel time from the college town to the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site are issues that need resolution if the numbers are to increase.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act: Many collaborative programs in schools and school districts are funded through OJJDP money. Many truancy prevention, alternative education, alcohol and drug prevention, and violence prevention programs have been implemented in schools with OJJDP funds. In addition, state juvenile justice funds currently go to communities in collaboration with schools. In all cases, juvenile justice funds from both these programs provide services to at-risk youth.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) funds for Kansas are minimal (both administered by SRS). SRS and KDHE will make most efficient use of these few dollars by working with KSDE to coordinate the dissemination of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant funds, which process would serve the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs and guidelines of the TANF and CCDBG. KSDE encourages all 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs to coordinate programs to best meet the needs of the students and families, and will encourage applicants for Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC awards to collaborate with state agencies for more effective use of funds.

B. Identify existing programs among agencies and organizations that may be shared collaboratively.

Training, technical assistance, evaluation and dissemination services are being offered by the following agencies. KSDE proposes to continue the collaboration for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC awardees.

<b>Agencies and Organizations available for initial Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Collaboration</b>	
<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Title</b>
KSCEA	Kansas Community Education Association
NCCE	National Center for Community Education
<i>NCEA</i>	National Community Education Association
<i>KDHE</i>	Kansas Department of Health and Environment
<i>NSACA</i>	National School Age Care Alliance
<i>CCS</i>	Coalition for Community Schools
<i>SRS</i>	Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services
<i>NIOST</i>	National Institute for Out-of-School Time
<i>NCREL</i>	North Central Regional Education Laboratory
<i>CIS</i>	Communities in Schools
<i>KACCRRRA</i>	Kansas Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies
<i>ASA</i>	Afterschool Alliance

**1.5 Provide a timeline for implementing program and awarding funds.**

April 17, 2002	Advisory Board meets to discuss policy.
May 23-28, 2002	Advisory Board electronically reviews Kansas application .
June 3, 2002	Kansas Application due to U.S. Department of Education.
June 10, 2002	RFP posted, disseminated.
July 9, 2002	Applicant workshop (Advisory Board invited).
Sept. early, 2002	Application deadline.
September, 2002	Training of judging panels.
September, 2002	Judging.
October, 2002	Recommendations to Kansas State Board of Education.
October, 2002	Award announcements, technical assistance begins

January, 2003

New programs begin

A number of organizations and agencies will provide assistance with dissemination of the RFP: Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC, including but not limited to the following: Kansas State Department of Education, Kansas Action for Children, Kansas Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, National Center for Community Education, National Community Education Association. The notice and RFP will appear on the KSDE website, and notices of the opportunity will be sent electronically to all Kansas school districts and to the networks inherent in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board, among others. Special efforts will be made to inform CBOs and faith-based organizations. During the first year, dissemination will occur primarily among networks and information systems of the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC advisory board. KSDE and IERPS will coordinate the efforts.

**1.6 Indicate whether the State educational agency will create priorities (in addition to the competitive priorities outlined in the statute) for the local application; describe those priorities.**

In order to meet the goals of the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, applicants must understand clearly the funding priorities and requirements of the applications. Priorities appear in this section. Other requirements appear in section 1.10.

**Absolute priority:** Kansas is required to make awards only to applicants that will primarily serve students who attend schools eligible for Title I schoolwide programs (at least 40% of the students qualify to receive free or reduced-cost meals).

**Competitive Priority:** Kansas must give priority to applications that will serve children in schools designated in need of improvement under Title I (Section 1116) and that are submitted jointly by school districts and community-based organizations.

**1.7 Explain the State educational agency matching requirements, if any, for local applicants.**

As the result of advice from the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Advisory Board and current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Project Directors (in the March 28, 2002, survey), the Kansas application will not require matching funds.

In lieu of a match, awardees are required to provide a detailed sustainability plan, including the integration of funds, programs, and resources that will sustain the program beyond the grant period. The proposed sustainability plan requirement will be included in the RFP.

Applicants will be made aware that Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds will diminish during the fourth and fifth years of the five-year grant. Funds as awarded will be provided in full during the first three years of the grant. During the fourth year, however, the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will pay 80 percent of the average of the first three years of the award, and during the fifth and final year of the grant, the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will pay 70 percent of the average of the first three years of the award.

### **1.8 Describe the Procedures and Criteria for Reviewing Applications and awarding funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis.**

A. Content of applications. The Request For Proposals will follow the U. S. Department of Education format, which includes:

- Statement of need  
Needs to be presented include: academic achievement status; poverty, drug and alcohol use; violence; Title I status, demographics including free- and reduced-lunch percentages, and others.
- Quality of proposed plan and program design  
Applicants will be required not only to show need, but also to provide evidence that the proposed program will address and meet the documented needs. Successful applications will explain how the program offers high-quality, research-based academic content using appropriate methods of teaching and learning, and refer to research studies as evidence. Furthermore, applicants must describe how the programs will attract and attain the students that the program targets. The collaboration among the school, community partners, and local advisory board needs to be shown to be genuine, with responsibilities of each clearly defined. Transportation issues must be clearly explained. This section should include a description of specific goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes.
- Adequacy of resources

Evidence must include committed support from the school board, superintendent, principal(s), teachers, and appropriate leaders of the CBO or faith-based partner. Such “committed support” will include formal assurances of collaboration in the areas of curriculum planning and delivery, objectives, and data gathering (standardized test scores, grades, demographics, incidents reports, and others). The application should explain the space to be used, and assure its accessibility. This section will explain the availability and collaborative use of various funds, the role of the advisory board in securing these and additional funds, and how the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds fit into the overall project. The application must assure that the applicant partners have the fiscal capacity to carry out the program.

- Management plan

In the experience of Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs, it has been found that the most successful programs have been developed and led by Project Directors with school and management experience. While the Kansas program will not require such experience, teacher or administrator certification is preferred. In any case, the application needs to explain how the experience of the project director and other leaders of the program will support the program. Charts and timetables are particularly helpful in describing the program’s structure, especially with regard to teachers, tutors, volunteers, and students served.

- Evaluation design

The application will explain the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. The evaluation should reference every Performance Goal, Indicator, and Target included in the project design and describe how they will be measured.

- Proposed Sustainability Plan

This section will include a clearly explained, proposed plan for sustaining the program.

- Budget

Budgets for each grant year should appear in chart format, following the federal design, which will be included in the RFP. A budget narrative may be included as well.

#### B. Judging and Award Procedures

The Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will adapt procedures for reviewing applications and awarding funds from two tested procedural guidelines: (1) United States Department of Education Guidelines for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC panels [www.ccsso.org/elo/resources.html](http://www.ccsso.org/elo/resources.html), and (2) OSEP and OSERS guidelines for U.S. Department of Education Discretionary Grant procedures. The latter procedures were written to avoid conflict of interest and to promote confidentiality on the part of reviewers, and, in fact, rely on the leadership of a “manager” for each reviewing panel. The manager’s task is to ensure that all discussion is based on the proposal, not on outside information.

The procedure will involve issuing a call for readers and selection of readers after reviewing conflict of interest statements. Written reader-training materials will be developed from the models noted above, and reader training will occur. The Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program intends to make checklist-guided site visits to the finalists, before making the award recommendations to the Kansas State Board of Education. Within the first weeks after the award announcements, KSDE and IERPS will begin the initial training with new awardees.

**1.9 Describe how the SEA will ensure awards are of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality, effective programs that will help participating students meet local content and student academic achievement standards and made in amounts of at least \$50,000. In particular, describe the estimated range of the numbers and sizes of awards and the anticipated project periods of awards.**

Consistent with statutory requirements, the minimum award in the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will be \$50,000 in each of five years. The State will ensure that awards are sufficient in size and scope to support high-quality, effective programs, will make every effort to achieve geographic diversity among awards, and will reserve the right to negotiate the award amount with applicants. Knowing that Kansas will receive \$2.1 million and will use 5 percent (\$108,500) for administrative expenses, Kansas has approximately \$2,061,500 to devote to grantees. National experience shows that the average successful 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site is funded at \$125,000. At

that rate, Kansas could fund about 16 sites. Currently, the 52 Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantees serve hundreds of separate sites.

In order to ensure the quality of the application, Kansas will write an RFP with precise instructions, as described briefly in 1.8 above. The RFP will include guidelines for Principles of Effectiveness and will use the Sixteen Characteristics that Lead to Comprehensive Program Planning for the Integration of 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC with Regular-Day Programs and Community Partners (NCREL):

- Climate for inclusion;
- Community Partnerships;
- Coordination with regular school-day learning program;
- Culturally sensitive climate;
- Evaluation design;
- Facilities management;
- Family literacy;
- Focus on at-risk students;
- Funding;
- Leadership and governance;
- Linkages between after school, and regular school personnel;
- Parent involvement;
- Engaging the public;
- Recreational programming;
- Safe and healthy environment;
- Staffing, staff qualifications and training; and
- Volunteers.

Regardless of the size of the grant proposed, applicants must convince the judging panel that costs are reasonable and necessary to carry out the program's purposes and objectives.

The SEA will make awards for programs for a period of not less than three years and not more than five years. As explained in 1.6 above, local applicants are required to submit a plan describing how the program will continue after funding ends.

**1.10 Describe any additional requirements or content specifications the State educational agency will require of its local applicants. (i.e. any emphasis on the kinds of program activities (identified in statute) and services for students and families, program management issues, specified times, or requirements for center operations.)**

**Requirements include:**

- \* Grantees are required to provide academic enrichment activities to help them meet State and local standards in the core content areas, such as reading, math, and science. (*Non-Reg Draft May 2002*).
- \* Applicants are required to address the Performance Goals and Performance Indicators as described in Section 1.3 above and in the RFP.
- \* Applicants are required to provide assurances that the program will allow full, appropriate access to students' and school data needed for planning, evaluation, and reporting on the program and on student progress, including assessments, demographics, grades, and others noted in Section 2.3.A below.
- \* Applicants are required to provide assurances that, if the grant is awarded, child-care licensing under KDHE 2002 regulations will be secured by the program and in force by the end of the first year of the program.
- \* Applicants are required to expect a site visit prior to becoming an awardee.
- \* Grantees are required to budget funds for attendance at training sessions. The budget must include funds for three individuals to attend four training sessions, annually: two, one-day sessions in Kansas; one two-day session in Washington, D.C.; and one other.
- \* Grantees are required to provide services to the families of children who are served in the program. (*Non-Reg Draft May 2002, p. 5*).
- \* Grantees are required to implement programs that meet the "principles of effectiveness" (*Non-Reg Draft May 2002, p. 6*).
  - A. Be based upon an assessment of objective data regarding the need for before and after school programs (including during summer recess period) and activities in the schools and communities;
  - B. Be based upon an established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high quality academic enrichment opportunities; and

C. If appropriate, be based upon scientifically –based research that provides evidence that the program or activity will help students meet the state and local student academic achievement standards.

\* Grantees are required to evaluate their programs periodically to assess progress toward achieving the goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment.

*(Non-Reg Draft May, 2002, p. 6).*

\* Grantees are required to make programs and services available to, and sites ADA accessible for, program students and/or family members with disabilities.

\* Applicants are required to describe a proposed Sustainability Plan for operating the program fully during the fourth and fifth years and after the grant ends. The Sustainability plan should explain how people, funds, and existing training and programs can be used and leveraged.

\* In addition to statutory requirements, Kansas applicants are required to provide assurances from the Board of Education of the applicant school district and the Board of Directors of the applicant organization, if appropriate, that both groups understand and approve the application’s submittal. All application requirements are included in Section 1.6 – 1.9 above and will appear in the RFP.

## **Section 2 – STATE ACTIVITIES**

*( Describe how the SEA will use its 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC state activity funds – up to three percent of its total 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC allocation).* A small amount of state activity funds (of up to 50% of state activity funds) will be transferred to carry out state level activities under one or more of the approved programs. KSDE will have negotiated a contract with IERPS to carry out most of the activities in this application.

### **2.1 Describe the methods the State Educational agency will use to monitor programs and activities.**

#### A. Site Visits:

- Potential site visits to finalists before final decision is made, as part of the decision-making process;
- site visits throughout the year after the program has begun.

#### B. Monitor by telephone or email on a regular basis using consistent format of questions

#### C. Mentoring contacts using experienced 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC staff members

- D. Require an APR that includes evidence of change in academic achievement(grades, assessments), response to specific questions
- E. Survey of all stakeholders each semester, conducted by the grantee with guidance from IERPS/KSDE.

**2.2 Explain, in specific detail, the State educational agency’s plan to provide ongoing technical assistance and training, evaluation, and dissemination of promising practices to ensure that programs implement effective strategies.**

Legislation requires three strategies: training and technical assistance, evaluation, and dissemination. The following section describes the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC plan for each.

Training and technical assistance (TA). KSDE will contract to University of Kansas School of Education Institute for Educational Research and Public Service (IERPS) to organize and manage the training and TA efforts. Every attempt will be made to piggyback training with agencies and organizations listed in 1.4.B above. The Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will provide training and TA in the following ways:

\* Two one-day training workshops led by KSDE and IERPS, and held in different regions of the state in order to minimize the expense for grantees. Some

KSDE/IERPS training topics will include:

- a. Management – program, staff, group
- b. Leadership
- c. Sustainability
- d. Evaluation and surveys
- e. Mentor training
- f. Analyzing Data for Continuous Improvement
- g. Record Keeping
- h. Working with Advisory Boards
- i. Communication
- j. Collaboration
- k. Programming
  - Content Area
  - Family Literacy
  - Integration with Day School Curriculum
  - Enrichment

- Integrating problem-solving into curriculum

\* Mott Foundation/National Center for Community Education(NCCE) Midwest Regional Training Sessions, led by three Kansas trainers and featuring experienced 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC staff members (Elder, Mott, and Harper are trained NCCE trainers). The Mott/NCCE contract will provide one regional workshop per year and will cover many of the same topics described above.

\* Mott Foundation new-grants training in Washington, D.C.

\* Training of Mentors by IERPS to assure consistent and comprehensive support to new awardees.

\*Telephone and email technical assistance by KSDE and IERPS at the request of the awardees.

Evaluation. KSDE will evaluate each grantee's program annually using the evidence provided in the monitoring section of 2.1 above. That evaluation will take into account at least the following points:

- Principles of effectiveness
- Academic Achievement in core subjects (Kansas will not offer state assessments in all grades until 2005-06, and will rely on existing state assessments, student grade cards, and local CRT tests for its evaluation.
- Judgment that the program serves the intended audience (baseline and end of year demographic data; range of deviation from application with regard to percentage of free and reduced meals students).
- Judgment of GPRA performance indicators as found in the application's Performance Goals, Performance Indicators, and Performance Targets; (the narrative from the grantee with describe progress toward "met " status of each target, and description.)
- Services to families of students served in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program
- Attendance, suspensions and expulsions, school violence
- Kansas Communities That Care data with regard to drug and alcohol use

Dissemination of promising practices. Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC will make grantees aware of promising practices through its training and technical assistance services, as described above, and through links on the KSDE and appropriate advisory-board websites.

**2.3 Describe how the SEA will evaluate the effectiveness of programs and activities, which shall include at a minimum:**

**A. A description of the performance indicators and performance measures that will be used to evaluate programs and activities (see evaluation chart following);**

<b>Evaluation: Performance Targets and Performance Measures</b>	
<b>Performance Target</b>	<b>Performance Measures</b>
1.1.1 and 2.1.1 Performance target: 100 percent of enrolled students will be exposed to a wide array of educational, recreational, career, and cultural opportunities and activities.	Program application forms, Program attendance Records, Program announcements, Surveys
1.2.1 Performance target: 80 percent of the program-enrolled K-12 participants will maintain high academic achievement and/or demonstrate continuous improvement in mathematics and reading.	School academic grade cards Program attendance records
1.3.1 Performance target: 100 percent of the program-enrolled K-12 participants will be offered tutoring support.	Program attendance records, tutoring records
1.4.1 Performance target: Day teachers of 60 percent of K-12 participants who are assigned homework will report increased rates of homework completion among their students who attend the program.	Teacher Surveys (Day Teachers) Program Attendance Records
1.5.1 and 2.3.1 Performance target: 90 percent of K-12 participants will participate in activities integrating real-life problem solving, arts education, and service learning.	Attendance Records, Activity Report, Lesson Plan/Class Syllabus.
1.6.1 Performance target: A variety of services and educational resources will be offered to the families/guardians of 100% of K-12 program participants.	Program Attendance Records Records and evidence of information dissemination (notes home, posters, email, etc)
2.2.1 Performance target: 90 percent of participants will not be suspended (in-school or out-of-school) while in the program.	School Attendance Records School Discipline Records
2.4.1 Performance target: 80 percent of program-enrolled K-12 participants will not be found to have engaged in violent acts at school.	School Discipline Records, School Crime Statistics, Building Reports, Community Law Enforcement Records of K-12 unlawful activity

**B. Strategies of public dissemination of the evaluations of programs, activities, and dissemination of promising practices.**

KSDE and IERPS will coordinate efforts to provide information for use and dissemination through current information systems (websites, listserves) of all advisory board agencies and organizations, and will make use of the news media for additional dissemination. The Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program leader will make presentations to the Kansas State Board of Education, and at a variety of professional associations (NCEA, NCCE, etc.). We will make them available through the regional education labs (MCREL) network, the state departments of education, Afterschool Alliance, and others. Furthermore, we intend to write an article on the findings for consideration by professional associations and journals.

**2.4 Describe the information and process the SEA will require to make continuation award decisions for local grantees.**

The Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will determine continuation awards using procedures similar to those used by USDE. Those procedures assign a program officer to each grant. That individual gathers the reporting data (APR) and makes a judgment according to acquired evidence. In the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, the program officer will collect a wider range of evidence, including reports from mentors, site visits, direct communications, APR, and others. The APR will ask project directors to describe the progress toward meeting each performance target, using the “met, not met, in progress” model. Local grantees should demonstrate substantial progress toward meeting their goals and objectives as stated in their original application. KSDE will ensure grantees’ progress through periodic evaluations as described in 2.3, above.

An awardee could potentially lose funding if, after appropriate evaluation, KSDE determines that the grantee’s program is not putting forth effort to meet the spirit and law of the federal statute or the Kansas 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC guidelines.