

District Profile

USD 365 Garnett

Mr. Donald Blome, Superintendent

Table of Contents:

Demographics:

- County Profile
- Census Data - Geographic Comparison

District Profile

- Current Enrollment
- Enrollment Trends by Race, Grade, Lunch Status
- District Staffing / Trends in Certified Non-Certified Personnel
- Comparison to Selected Districts

Adequate Yearly Progress:

- Trends by group for all AYP categories: Percent Tested / Proficient Advanced / Attendance Rates / Graduation Rates
 - District Trend Profile
 - Building Trend Data
- District / Building Improvement Information (If Applicable)

Reading Assessments

- Overview - Trends All Grades
- Score Detail - Trends by Grade
- Reading Scores by Group

Mathematics Assessments

- Overview - Trends All Grades
- Score Detail - Trends by Grade
- Math Scores by Group

Science Assessments

- Overview - Trends All Grades
- Score Detail - Trends by Grade
- Science Scores by Group

County Profile Information

Anderson County, Kansas

At the time of the US Census 2010, the population of Anderson county was approximately 8102. This represents a -0.1% change from the year 2000 as compared to a 11.8 % change in the state of Kansas. With a total number of 584.3 square miles in the county, the population density for the county is 13.9 people per square mile (Kansas state population density is 34.9 per square mile compared to 87.3 per square mile in the United States). According to projections collected by the US Census Bureau, the percentage change in total population from the year 2010 through 2030 is estimated at 5 for the county (11.8 percent change estimated in the state population).

The following table shows the change in racial composition of the county over the past 9 years:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	% Change
White	7984	8054	7973	7989	7872	7828	7736	7731	7817	7726	-3.3%
Black	47	56	58	61	62	66	71	76	91	94	50.0%
Am Indian / Alaskan	109	110	115	117	120	117	119	118	123	127	14.2%
Asian	19	20	20	19	21	22	21	21	20	23	17.4%
Hawaiian / Islander	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0.0%

***Source: Kansas Statistical Abstract "Population in Kansas, by Race and County, April 1, 2010"**

At the time of the 2000 Census, Anderson county had approximately 88 people reporting a Hispanic / Latino ethnicity residing in the county. This represented 1.08 percent of the county population as compared to 7 percent in the state for the same period. By the year 2010, the total number was 123 or 1.51 percent of the population, representing a change of 39.77 percent. For the same 10-year period, the state of Kansas had a 59.38 percent change in Hispanic / Latino population. Approximately 0.6 percent of the county population surveyed in 2010 reported being foreign-born and 3.3 percent of the population over 5 years of age reported speaking a language other than English in their homes.

According to the US Census, recent estimates (based on NAICS 2007 adjusted report) show that approximately 573 square miles of the county is dedicated to farming (98.19 %). The portion of the county considered to be rural as defined by the US Census Bureau (places of 2500 or more persons) is 99.4 percent of total acres with the remaining 0.6 percent being considered urban areas.


INDUSTRY: Civilian employed population 16 years and over - Percent

Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	7.6	Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	6.5
Construction	14.9	Information	0.5
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	26.9	Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	2.9
Wholesale Trade	2.1	Manufacturing	9.5
Retail Trade	11.2	Public Administration	4.4
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services	4.7	Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste	4.3

US Census: Geographic Comparison

American Community Survey Data	Garnett	Anderson County	Kansas	USA
FAMILY INCOME:				
Median Income in families with children	\$35,230	\$39,145	\$58,517	\$60,074
Percent of families with children in poverty	25.6	17.9	13.2	16.6
Percent of households with Public Asst income	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.4
Percent of households with Food Stamp benefits	13.3	8.8	6.8	8.5
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:				
No High School Diploma / GED				
Population 18-24 years old - percent	11.4	8.8	13.7	17.2
Population over 25 years old - percent	12.7	11.5	11	15.5
High School Diploma or Equivalency				
Population 18-24 years old - percent	27.1	60.6	28.8	32
Population over 25 years old - percent	37.5	42.9	29.5	29.3
Bachelor's Degree or More				
Population 18-24 years old - percent	4.3	5.7	9.5	9
Population over 25 years old - percent	15.2	15.3	28.8	27.5
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION:				
Percent of families with children under 18	36.3	35.9	31.4	31
Married couple families	27	27.6	22.4	21.4
Single parent household- female only	4.3	4	6.7	7.3
Single parent household- male only	5	4.3	2.3	2.2
HOIJNG DATA:				
Year housing built - median year	1956	1955	1970	1974
Year housing built - median age / years	55	56	41	37
Median value of owner-occupied homes	\$84,500	\$86,600	\$118,500	\$185,400
Occupancy rate of all housing units	78.5	83.7	90	88.2

UNEMPLOYMENT DATA:



Comparison to Other Cities in the County:


City	Population	% Ages 5-19	Ave Family Size	% 25 Yrs + No Diploma	Single Mother HH	Median Family Income	Families in Poverty
Garnett	3196	18.9	2.81	12.7	4.3	\$35,230	25.6
Colony	468	17.1	2.78	15.9	2.9	\$50,893	13.2

District Demographics

USD 365 is comprised of the following schools:

DISTRICT BUILDINGS:	City	Building Type	Grades Served	2011-12 Enrollment
ANDERSON COUNTY JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL	Garnett	High School	7-12	460
GARNETT ELEMENTARY	Garnett	Elementary	2-6	288
IRVING PRIMARY *	Garnett	Elementary	K-1	136
WESTPHALIA	Westphalia	Elementary	K-8	120
GREELEY ELEMENTARY	Greeley	Elementary	K-6	66
MONT IDA ELEMENTARY	Welda	Elementary	1-8	21

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT TREND:



ENROLLMENT HISTORY BY RACE


The chart below details the change in enrollment and racial diversity of the district as a whole over the past five years. According to the data as reported by the KSDE School Finance website, total enrollment in the district has changed by percent since the 2007-08 school year. Enrollment by white students has changed by -83 students while enrollments by black students has had a net change of 3 students.

School Year	Total Enrolled	White	Black	Hispanic	Am Indian / Alaskan	Asian	Hawaiian / Islander	Multiple Races
2007-08	1157	1116	8	15	17	1	0	0
2008-09	1160	1119	7	15	17	2	0	0
2009-10	1150	1084	5	33	7	2	0	19
2010-11	1137	1061	12	29	28	3	0	4
2011-12	1097	1033	11	25	21	3	0	4

Economically Disadvantaged Students

DISTRICT HISTORY FREE REDUCED LUNCH ELIGIBILITY:

This graphic shows the changes in the percentage of students eligible for free lunch, reduced lunch, or no eligibility for the past four years.




CURRENT ELIGIBILITY BY BUILDING:

	Enrollment	Free Lunch	Reduced Lunch	Percent FRL
ANDERSON COUNTY JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL	460	156	76	50.4%
GARNETT ELEMENTARY	288	111	52	56.6%
IRVING PRIMARY *	136	62	18	58.8%
WESTPHALIA	120	53	15	56.7%
GREELEY ELEMENTARY	66	34	7	62.1%
MONT IDA ELEMENTARY	21	1	2	14.3%

COMPARATIVE HISTORY FREE REDUCED LUNCH ELIGIBILITY:

The following chart shows the eligibility for free and reduced lunches over time as compared to the county and state averages for the same school years.

District FRL % — County FRL % — State FRL % —



District Personnel

No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title II, Part A ensures that all K-12 students have teachers with subject matter knowledge and teaching skills necessary to help all students achieve high academic standards regardless of their individual learning styles or needs. All general education core content teachers must be "highly qualified."

Below is the status of USD 365 teachers for the 2010-11 school year. Data provided by special request from the KSDE Research & Evaluation help desk.

Subject	Teachers	Highly Qualified	% Highly Qualified
World Languages	8	8	100.0%
Science	40	34	85.0%
Mathematics	32	32	100.0%
History & Government	36	36	100.0%
Fine Arts	60	60	100.0%
English Language Arts	42	42	100.0%
Elementary	82	82	100.0%

CERTIFIED PERSONNEL:


The following data was obtained via the KSDE website, School Finance Publications "Selected School Stats by District" reports and indicates the number of fully certified personnel in each category.

K-12 Teachers	Special Ed Teachers	Special Ed Director	Reading Teachers	Curriculum Specialists	Library Specialists
88.1	0	0	5	0	2

NON-CERTIFIED PERSONNEL:

Regular Ed Aides	Special Ed Paras	Technology Others	Technology Director	Library Aides
4.3	0	0.0	2.0	0.0

STUDENT / TEACHER RATIO



Demographics Comparisons

Comparison to Other Districts in the Area:

The following districts were chosen for comparison based on a combination of approximate student enrollment and their relative proximity to USD 257.

COMPARISON DISTRICTS	District County	2010-11 Enrollment	Free Reduced Lunch	Student / Teacher Ratio	Assessed Valuation pr/Pupil
USD 257 Iola	Allen	1,332	57.7	13.5	40,316
USD 362 Prairie View	Linn	994	55.6	14.3	134,893
USD 365 Garnett	Anderson	1,131	53.7	12.3	55,601
USD 367 Osawatomie	Miami	1,183	65.7	14.4	39,811
USD 436 Caney Valley	Montgomery	890	50.3	15	36,768
USD 447 Cherryvale	Montgomery	1,000	52.4	15.7	24,080
USD 493 Columbus	Cherokee	1,074	53.4	13.9	54,110
USD 508 Baxter Springs	Cherokee	1,042	63.3	16.4	25,625

District Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) is based on the premise that in 12 years, every child will be at a minimum proficiency on the state reading and mathematics assessments. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is the process for making judgment as to whether or not all public elementary and secondary schools, districts, and states are reaching the annual targets on these assessments as well as meeting minimum requirements for graduation and attendance rates to ensure that all students achieve the state's definition of proficiency by 2013-2014.

The table(s) below depict whether AYP was met for by each of the student subgroups in each of the indicators reviewed. Any subgroup for which there are fewer than 20 students will not be shown.

*NOTE: 2010-11 Percent Proficient : source is KSDE Website - Requirements of AYP Table. Other years obtained from table on the District Report Card link (2010-11 not yet available).

	KEY: Y = AYP Met C = Met Conditionally N = AYP Not Met N/A = Does not apply									
	READING			MATHEMATICS			GRADUATION		ATTENDANCE	
	% Tested	Prof Above	AYP Met	% Tested	Prof Above	AYP Met	Grad Rate	Grad AYP Met	Attend Rate	Attend AYP Met
All Students										
2006-07	99.8	79.9	Y	100.0	77.7	Y	88.4	Y	94.4	Y
2007-08	100.0	76.1	Y	99.8	70.0	N	89.0	Y	94.9	Y
2009-10	100.0	89.1	Y	100.0	86.7	Y	87.9	Y	94.9	Y
2010-11	100.0	91.3	Y	100.0	85.2	Y		Y	95.3	Y
Free & Reduced Lunch										
2006-07	99.6	73.4	Y	100.0	72.0	Y				
2007-08	100.0	66.4	N	99.6	63.3	N				
2009-10	100.0	87.0	Y	100.0	83.6	Y				
2010-11		87.9	Y		83.1	Y		N/A		N/A
Students with Disabilities										
2006-07	100.0	64.2	Y	100.0	63.2	Y				
2007-08	100.0	45.1	N	100.0	47.2	N				
2009-10	100.0	64.3	Y	100.0	78.3	Y				
2010-11		81.5	Y		76.9	Y		N/A		N/A
African-Americans										
2010-11			N/A			N/A		N/A		N/A
Hispanic										
2010-11			N/A			N/A		N/A		N/A
White										
2006-07	99.8	80.1	Y	100.0	78.1	Y				
2007-08	100.0	75.5	Y	99.8	69.5	N				
2009-10	100.0	89.7	Y	100.0	87.3	Y				
2010-11		91.7	Y		85.9	Y		N/A		N/A
Asian										
2010-11			N/A			N/A		N/A		N/A
American Indian / Alaska Native										
2010-11			N/A			N/A		N/A		N/A
Multi-Racial & Undeclared										
2010-11			N/A			N/A		N/A		N/A

BUILDING-LEVEL AYP DATA

The table(s) below depict whether AYP was met for the every subcategory in each of the subjects reviewed.

	READING		MATHEMATICS		OTHER		BLDG AYP Met
	Performance AYP Met	Participation AYP Met	Performance AYP Met	Participation AYP Met	Graduation Rate	Attendance Rate	
	KEY: Y = AYP Met C = Met Conditionally N = AYP Not Met N/A = Does not apply						
ANDERSON COUNTY JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL							
2006-07	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
2007-08	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
2008-09	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
2009-10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y
2010-11	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N/A	N
GARNETT ELEMENTARY							
2005-06	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	N
2006-07	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2007-08	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	N
2008-09	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2009-10	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2010-11	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	y
GREELEY ELEMENTARY							
2006-07	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2007-08	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2008-09	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2009-10	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2010-11	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	N
IRVING PRIMARY *							
2006-07	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2010-11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	y
MONT IDA ELEMENTARY							
2006-07	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2007-08	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2008-09	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2009-10	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2010-11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	y
WESTPHALIA							
2006-07	C	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2007-08	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2008-09	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2009-10	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y
2010-11	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	y

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT STATUS / HISTORY

Improvement Status Definitions

On Improvement: A district that does not make AYP for two consecutive years must be identified for On Improvement. Identifying a district for improvement serves as a formal acknowledgement that the district is not meeting the challenge of successfully teaching all of its students. The identification marks the beginning of the improvement process: a set of structured interventions designed to help a district identify, analyze, and address issues that prevent student academic success. The state will provide a district that is identified for improvement with extensive support in designing and implementing a plan to improve student achievement. Technical Assistance will focus on Curriculum Alignment, Data Analysis, and Leadership.

Corrective Action: Correctivaction refers to steps taken by the district to substantially and directly respond to serious instructional, managerial, and organizational problems. Some options are to replace staff related to the inability of the district to make AYP, remove individual schools from the jurisdiction of the district and arrange for their public supervision, appoint a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district in place of the superintendent and school board, or abolish / restructure the district.

School Year	Years on Improvement	Improvement Status	Subject of Improvement	Number of Schools on Improvement
2010-11		District is not targeted for improvement in any monitored area		
2011-12		District is not targeted for improvement in any monitored area		

District Reading Assessments

READING PERFORMANCE GOALS BY YEAR:

In order to meet the requirements of adequate yearly progress, every student group must meet or exceed annual targets in reading while maintaining a participation rate of 95% or more. The chart below details the annual performance goals for the past several years.


School Year	K-8 Student Goal	9-12 Students Goal	District Reading Goal	District % Met Goal	Kansas State % Met Goal
2006-07	69.50	65.0	65	79.8	81
2007-08	75.60	72.0	72	75.6	84.3
2008-09	79.90	76.7	76.7	88.7	85.8
2009-10	83.70	81.3	81.3	93.1	86.3
2010-11	87.80	86.0	86	90.99	87.8

READING SCORES BY GRADE:


The following graphs show the change in percentage scoring within each of the following ranges for each of the past years indicated.



3rd Grade Reading:




4th Grade Reading:




Academic Warning ■ Meets Standard ■ Exceeds Standard ■
 Approaches Standard ■ Exemplary ■

5th Grade Reading:



6th Grade Reading:




Academic Warning ■
Approaches Standard ■


Meets Standard ■

Exceeds Standard ■
Exemplary ■

7th Grade Reading:




8th Grade Reading:



Academic Warning ■ Meets Standard ■ Exceeds Standard ■
 Approaches Standard ■ Exemplary ■


11th Grade Reading:




Reading Scores - Disaggregated Groups

Traditionally, students who receive free or reduced lunch or special education support score at lower levels on state assessments than those who are not eligible for these special services. The graphs below compare those scoring at or above standard who are receiving additional support to the "All Students" category as data only for those not receiving services is not available. A comparison of students who received support versus those that did not would likely yield a larger discrepancy between groups concerning performance levels. (Source: Special Request KSDE - USD Assess by Grade / Group)

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS:




STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:



NOTE: Groups of less than 10 students are not publicly reported.


DISSAGGREGATED GROUP: White Students

District Disagg Group █ District ALL Students █ State Disagg Group █



DISSAGGREGATED GROUP: Hispanic Students

District Disagg Group █ District ALL Students █ State Disagg Group █



NOTE: Groups of less than 10 students are not publicly reported.

District Mathematics Assessments


MATH PERFORMANCE GOALS BY YEAR:

In order to meet the requirements of adequate yearly progress, every student group must meet or exceed annual targets in reading while maintaining a participation rate of 95% or more. The chart below details the annual performance goals for the past several years.


School Year	K-8 Student Goal	9-12 Students Goal	District Math Goal	District % Met Goal	Kansas State % Met Goal
2006-07	66.80	55.7	55.7	77.6	78.2
2007-08	73.40	64.6	64.6	69.5	81
2008-09	77.80	70.5	70.5	89.5	82.8
2009-10	82.30	76.4	76.4	87.6	83.1
2010-11	86.70	82.3	82.3	84.7	85.58

MATH SCORES BY GRADE:


The following graphs show the change in percentage scoring within each of the following ranges for each of the past years indicated.



3rd Grade Math:



4th Grade Math




Academic Warning ■
Approaches Standard ■


Meets Standard ■

Exceeds Standard ■
Exemplary ■


5th Grade Math:




6th Grade Math:



7th Grade Math:




8th Grade Math:



Academic Warning ■ Meets Standard ■ Exceeds Standard ■
 Approaches Standard ■ Exemplary ■


10th Grade Math:




Mathematics Scores - Disaggregated Groups

Traditionally, students who receive free or reduced lunch or special education support score at lower levels on state assessments than those who are not eligible for these special services. The graphs below compare those scoring at or above standard who are receiving additional support to the "All Students" category as data only for those not receiving services is not available. A comparison of students who received support versus those that did not would likely yield a larger discrepancy between groups concerning performance levels. (Source: Special Request KSDE - USD Assess by Grade / Group)

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS:




STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:



NOTE: Groups of less than 10 students are not publicly reported.


DISSAGGREGATED GROUP: White Students

District Disagg Group █ District ALL Students █ State Disagg Group █



DISSAGGREGATED GROUP: Hispanic Students

District Disagg Group █ District ALL Students █ State Disagg Group █



NOTE: Groups of less than 10 students are not publicly reported.

District Science Assessments

The Kansas science assessment is administered annually to students in 4th, 7th, and 10th or 11th grades. Although NCLB requires an annual science assessment, to date does not include scores or participation rates in AYP. Scores and participation rates are used for quality performance accreditation (QPA) purposes only.

Targets are the percentage of students scoring at Meets Standard and above. QPA targets remain constant and do not change over time and are currently as shown below:


School Year	4th Grade QPA Goal 73%	7th Grade QPA Goal 71%	High School Students QPA Goal 69%
2007-08	93.0	84.0	84.0
2008-09	99.0	86.0	76.0
2009-10	98.0	93.0	91.0
2010-11	99.0	95.0	84.0

SCIENCE SCORES BY GRADE:



The following graphs show the change in percentage scoring within each of the following ranges for each of the past years indicated.

Academic Warning ■ Approaches Standard ■ Meets Standard ■ Exceeds Standard ■ Exemplary ■


4th Grade Science:



7th Grade Science




11th Grade Science:




Science Scores - Disaggregated Groups

Traditionally, students who receive free or reduced lunch or special education support score at lower levels on state assessments than those who are not eligible for these special services. The graphs below compare those scoring at or above standard who are receiving additional support to the "All Students" category as data only for those not receiving services is not available. A comparison of students who received support versus those that did not would likely yield a larger discrepancy between groups concerning performance levels. (Source: Special Request KSDE - USD Assess by Grade / Group)

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS:




STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:



NOTE: Groups of less than 10 students are not publicly reported.

DISSAGGREGATED GROUP: White Students

District Disagg Group District ALL Students State Disagg Group



NOTE: Groups of less than 10 students are not publicly reported.