

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 2007-08

KENTUCKY



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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 (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- 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 V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 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-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

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:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:
500 Mero Street, First Floor, Capital Plaza Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Mary Ann Miller

Telephone: 502-564-3141

Fax: 502-564-5680

e-mail: MaryAnn.Miller@education.ky.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Elaine Farris

Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 11:07:28 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	339,126	339,126	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	431	431	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,456	3,456	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	35,765	35,765	100.0
Hispanic	8,387	8,387	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	285,058	285,058	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43,160	43,160	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,989	4,989	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	171,121	171,121	100.0
Migratory students	999	999	100.0
Male	174,005	174,005	100.0
Female	165,098	165,098	100.0
Comments: The number of students are based on attempting the test and not being assigned a performance level.			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,608	19.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30,881	71.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,671	8.5

Total	43,160	
Comments: The number of students are based on attempting the test and not being assigned a performance level.		

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	343,954	343,954	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	446	446	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,532	3,532	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	36,583	36,583	100.0
Hispanic	8,612	8,612	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	288,695	288,695	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	44,073	44,073	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,132	5,132	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	175,297	175,297	100.0
Migratory students	1,019	1,019	100.0
Male	177,190	177,190	100.0
Female	166,738	166,738	100.0
Comments: The number of students are based on attempting the test and not being assigned a performance level.			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,870	20.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,504	71.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,699	8.4
Total	44,073	
Comments: The number of students are based on attempting the test and not being assigned a performance level.		

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	142,997	142,997	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	188	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,428	1,428	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	15,036	15,036	100.0
Hispanic	3,394	3,394	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	120,628	120,628	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,326	17,326	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,936	1,936	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	68,879	68,879	100.0
Migratory students	323	323	100.0
Male	72,573	72,573	100.0
Female	70,412	70,412	100.0
Comments: The number of students are based on attempting the test and not being assigned a performance level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,227	18.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,529	72.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,570	9.1
Total	17,326	
Comments: The number of students are based on attempting the test and not being assigned a performance level.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	49,578	36,580	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	54	42	77.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	502	433	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,218	2,870	55.0
Hispanic	1,434	930	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	41,240	31,503	76.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,003	3,349	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,010	616	61.0
Economically disadvantaged students	26,907	17,592	65.4
Migratory students	221	137	62.0
Male	25,525	18,742	73.4
Female	24,051	17,836	74.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	49,578	37,263	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	54	43	79.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	502	413	82.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,218	2,998	57.5
Hispanic	1,434	942	65.7
White, non-Hispanic	41,240	32,040	77.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,003	3,812	54.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,010	602	59.6
Economically disadvantaged students	26,907	18,131	67.4
Migratory students	221	138	62.4
Male	25,525	18,423	72.2
Female	24,051	18,838	78.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is administered in the 4th grade for elementary.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	49,030	34,681	70.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	38	59.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	477	399	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,121	2,587	50.5
Hispanic	1,399	883	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	40,879	30,062	73.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,896	3,218	46.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	852	453	53.2
Economically disadvantaged students	26,245	16,148	61.5
Migratory students	211	124	58.8
Male	25,002	17,720	70.9
Female	24,022	16,959	70.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	49,030	34,935	71.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	43	67.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	477	381	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,121	2,619	51.1
Hispanic	1,399	910	65.0
White, non-Hispanic	40,879	30,271	74.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,896	3,600	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	852	465	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	26,245	16,475	62.8
Migratory students	211	118	55.9
Male	25,002	16,747	67.0
Female	24,022	18,188	75.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	49,030	33,798	68.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	42	65.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	477	367	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,121	2,301	44.9
Hispanic	1,399	830	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	40,879	29,598	72.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,896	3,422	49.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	852	411	48.2
Economically disadvantaged students	26,245	15,622	59.5
Migratory students	211	109	51.7
Male	25,002	17,421	69.7
Female	24,022	16,377	68.2
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	48,167	30,772	63.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	61	38	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	483	402	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,112	2,209	43.2
Hispanic	1,236	674	54.5
White, non-Hispanic	40,319	26,887	66.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,593	2,402	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	769	350	45.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,413	13,470	53.0
Migratory students	232	137	59.1
Male	24,868	15,651	62.9
Female	23,297	15,120	64.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	48,167	34,430	71.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	61	42	68.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	483	399	82.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,112	2,763	54.0
Hispanic	1,236	785	63.5
White, non-Hispanic	40,319	29,790	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,593	3,029	45.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	769	390	50.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,413	15,840	62.3
Migratory students	232	140	60.3
Male	24,868	16,441	66.1
Female	23,297	17,989	77.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is administered in the 4th grade for elementary.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	48,661	30,591	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	32	49.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	450	354	78.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,135	2,036	39.6
Hispanic	1,186	637	53.7
White, non-Hispanic	40,985	27,051	66.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,204	2,032	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	508	192	37.8
Economically disadvantaged students	25,287	13,227	52.3
Migratory students	108	43	39.8
Male	25,295	15,179	60.0
Female	23,363	15,410	66.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	48,661	33,372	68.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	38	58.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	450	352	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,135	2,497	48.6
Hispanic	1,186	703	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	40,985	29,231	71.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,204	2,273	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	508	194	38.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,287	14,778	58.4
Migratory students	108	41	38.0
Male	25,295	15,773	62.4
Female	23,363	17,597	75.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is administered in the 7th grade for middle school.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	49,367	28,164	57.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	38	52.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	459	369	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,280	1,891	35.8
Hispanic	1,207	599	49.6
White, non-Hispanic	41,575	24,886	59.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,052	1,812	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	544	186	34.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,902	11,129	44.7
Migratory students	90	32	35.6
Male	25,438	13,971	54.9
Female	23,928	14,193	59.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	49,367	32,191	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	46	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	459	367	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,280	2,477	46.9
Hispanic	1,207	677	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	41,575	28,160	67.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,052	1,958	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	544	178	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	24,902	13,574	54.5
Migratory students	90	44	48.9
Male	25,438	14,894	58.6
Female	23,928	17,297	72.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	49,367	29,405	59.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	44	60.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	459	323	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,280	1,610	30.5
Hispanic	1,207	551	45.7
White, non-Hispanic	41,575	26,492	63.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,052	1,958	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	544	136	25.0
Economically disadvantaged students	24,902	11,791	47.3
Migratory students	90	34	37.8
Male	25,438	15,707	61.7
Female	23,928	13,698	57.2
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	49,397	25,211	51.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	28	44.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	451	333	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,232	1,467	28.0
Hispanic	1,035	400	38.6
White, non-Hispanic	41,861	22,663	54.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,032	1,322	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	440	110	25.0
Economically disadvantaged students	24,409	9,247	37.9
Migratory students	109	36	33.0
Male	25,569	12,989	50.8
Female	23,824	12,221	51.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	49,397	32,936	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	36	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	451	363	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,232	2,491	47.6
Hispanic	1,035	594	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	41,861	28,982	69.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,032	1,866	30.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	440	134	30.5
Economically disadvantaged students	24,409	13,647	55.9
Migratory students	109	52	47.7
Male	25,569	15,222	59.5
Female	23,824	17,713	74.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is administered in the 7th grade for middle school.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,419	17,109	38.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	20	39.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	420	276	65.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,610	829	18.0
Hispanic	731	215	29.4
White, non-Hispanic	38,160	15,601	40.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,376	501	11.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	69	19.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,613	4,357	24.7
Migratory students	17	N<10	
Male	22,037	8,299	37.7
Female	22,378	8,809	39.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,189	29,519	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	40	60.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	493	362	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,419	2,313	42.7
Hispanic	916	451	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	41,793	26,086	62.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,289	924	17.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	444	100	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,775	10,264	47.1
Migratory students	37	13	35.1
Male	25,194	13,199	52.4
Female	23,988	16,319	68.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
High School			
All students	44,419	18,332	41.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	22	43.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	420	230	54.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,610	722	15.7
Hispanic	731	196	26.8
White, non-Hispanic	38,160	17,002	44.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,376	548	12.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	36	10.0
Economically disadvantaged students	17,613	4,906	27.9
Migratory students	17	N<10	
Male	22,037	9,666	43.9
Female	22,378	8,665	38.7
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,169	844	72.2
Districts	174	104	59.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	833	669	80.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	771	613	79.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	62	56	90.3
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
173	103	59.5
Comments: The 175 count includes Fort Knox and Fort Campbell who are allocated Title I funds. Because they are government schools the Title I allocations are redistributed to public school districts and 173 public school districts received Title I allocations.		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	22
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	5
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	7
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	15
Comments:	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Most schools in restructuring chose to employ a School Administrator Mentor. The mentor works with the principals and assistant principals on administrative duties, which allows the principal to become more of an instructional leader. Schools had to plan for restructuring by developing a restructuring plan that included the following components: governance, leadership, environment and organization. Governance involves diminishing school-based management and decision making or increases control, monitoring and oversight of the school's operations and educational program by the district.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Kentucky has taken the following measures to address the achievement problems for 91 districts identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring in the 07-08 school year. State Title I consultants reviewed the improvement plans for activities and goals that would improve student achievement with groups of students that did not make AYP. Districts identified for corrective action received technical assistance through intervention models that included Voluntary Partnership Assistance Teams, State Assistance Teams, or Network Assistance Teams. The teams consisted of district achievement gap coordinators, superintendent mentors, local school board mentors, state Title I consultants, and district administrators. The teams met on a regular basis to develop, evaluate and monitor progress toward goals set in the district improvement plan. Assistance was also provided through the assignment of Highly Skilled Educators and Targeted Assistance Coaches to districts most in need.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	24
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	10
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	24
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	2
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	3
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	10	10
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/27/08
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	87,638	
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	22,930	20,659
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	26.2	
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	28,067	28,629
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	32.0	
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 200708	117	
Comments: The table does not allow for a clear explanation of percentages of proficient students in Math and Reading. For example, in Kentucky's high schools only 10th graders are tested in Reading and only 11th graders are tested in Math; thus, the calculation in the table shows a reduced percentage of proficient students. The following is the correct information according to what the table requests. The total number of students for Mathematics in 2008 is 48,349 with a proficiency percentage of 47.43% and in 2007 was 48,910 with a proficiency percentage of 42.24%. The total number of students for Reading in 2008 is 48,820 with a proficiency percentage of 57.49% and in 2007 was 50,211 with a proficiency percentage of 57.02%.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	48
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	37
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	98
Comments:	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	Combination of strategies 1, 2, 3, and 4 were used to support schools in improvement and used by Highly Skilled Educators to address issues found in scholastic audits.	146	23	25		"Other positive outcomes " data is not collected.
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p>

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Effective strategies were shared through "The Improvement Imperative: Recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Panel on Interventions in Low-Performing Schools" and is posted on the Kentucky Department of Education website. Sharing of instructional strategies is provided by Achievement Gap Coordinators, Highly Skilled Educators, and other assistance teams through their work with low-performing schools and districts.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Technical Assistance was provided in the form of a WebEx session that focused on the requirements of 1003g funds, the state application for securing funds and how the funds could be used. Schools were also provided technical assistance on requirements for school leadership support teams(SLST). The purpose of the SLST is to develop, monitor and support the four components of restructuring. Effectiveness is evaluated through the application, monitoring of the implementation of the intervention program and partnering with the districts on the leadership intervention program. Building local capacity (leadership) is a major goal and focus.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA Title I consultants met with districts having 1003g schools to assist the schools with a guided self study to assess their needs for improvement. The Achievement Gap Coordinators provided training on the School-Based Achievement Gap Study Model, which is an abbreviated version of the Scholastic Audit and Review process used to identify and address areas of deficiency in whole school improvement and student achievement. Other actions included Highly Skilled Educators being assigned to identified schools and state Title I staff assigned to local School Leadership Support Teams.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83l.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	76,247
Applied to transfer	1,081
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	614

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

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

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,049,343
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	26
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school³ that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	39,885
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,719
Received supplemental educational services	3,897
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,360,362
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	177,284	174,642	98.5	2,642	1.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	19,481	19,334	99.2	147	0.8
Low-poverty schools	17,434	17,353	99.5	81	0.5
All elementary schools	75,553	75,151	99.5	402	0.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	11,279	10,962	97.2	317	2.8
Low-poverty schools	38,723	38,013	98.2	710	1.8
All secondary schools	96,734	94,965	98.2	1,769	1.8
Comments: There is a difference in the sum of all academic classes and the sums of all elementary and secondary schools because there were 4997 classes identified in schools designated as "unknown" poverty level via the Kentucky Department of Education. Of those 4997 classes, 4526 did report having HQ teachers (90.6%).					

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

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

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state department allows districts to opt for either at the district's discretion.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
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	75.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	60.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	40.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	72.0	44.0
Poverty metric used	Based on the percentage of the student population that qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.	
Secondary schools	55.0	34.0
Poverty metric used	Based on the percentage of the student population that qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state also has schools/districts that use the push-in, immersion and Newcomer Center as types of language instruction educational programs.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	12,919
Comments: Kentucky only counts LEP students who are present during the annual State ELP testing window.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	12,033
Comments: The difference of 22 reflects the students not capable of taking the State ELP assessment and right now Kentucky does not have an Alternate ELP for these students. It will be coming soon.	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	8,079
Japanese	488
Bosnian	401
Vietnamese	390
Chinese Mandarin	290

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,884
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	35
Total	12,919
Comments: Kentucky had 23 students not capable of doing the regular State ELP assessment, 3 students who were absent during the testing window, and 9 students who refused to take the test.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,391
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10.8
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,000
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	33
Total	12,033
Comments: 22 alternate students, 3 absent, and 8 refused to take the test make up the 33 who did not test.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	4,230	35.3
ELP attainment	1,287	10.7
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: Kentucky does not offer state content tests in the students' native language(s).	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
Comments: Kentucky does not offer state content tests in the students' native language(s).

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
Comments: Kentucky does not offer state content tests in the students' native language(s).

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
Comments: Kentucky does not offer state content tests in the students' native language(s).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
570	231	801
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
645	436	67.6	209
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
661	479	72.5	182
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
275	158	57.5	117
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	30
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	10
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	26
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	29
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	10
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	12
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
7,426	4,075	31

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	7,621
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	450

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	30	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	17	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	13	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	10	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	11	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	16	1,727
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	13	387
PD provided to principals	16	224
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	13	150
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	11	367
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	41
Total	69	2,896

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/16/07	09/11/07	58
Comments:		

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

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky could shorten the distribution of Title III funds if the state received its allocation sooner from the U.S. Department of Education, according to KDE's Division of Budgets.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	83.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Subgroup data is not currently available since the student level data collection system has not been fully implemented.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4.8
Hispanic	5.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.7
Female	2.6
Comments: Some subgroup data is not currently available since the student level data collection system has not been fully implemented.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	155	155
LEAs with subgrants	19	19
Total	174	174
Comments:		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	249	127
K	312	973
1	300	397
2	297	419
3	291	427
4	270	443
5	258	462
6	207	632
7	179	1,073
8	209	1,376
9	191	2,891
10	144	2,119
11	130	1,701
12	166	1,423
Ungraded	0	69
Total	3,203	14,532
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	215	338
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,875	13,991
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	29	29
Hotels/Motels	84	174
Total	3,203	14,532
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127
K	973
1	397
2	419
3	427
4	443
5	462
6	632
7	1,073
8	1,376
9	2,891
10	2,119
11	1,701
12	1,423
Ungraded	69
Total	14,532
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	12
Migratory children/youth	112
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,375
Limited English proficient students	368
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	19
Expedited evaluations	19
Staff professional development and awareness	19
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
Transportation	19
Early childhood programs	19
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	19
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	19
Counseling	19
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	19
Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
School supplies	19
Referral to other programs and services	19
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	19
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	19
School Selection	19
Transportation	19
School records	19
Immunizations	19
Other medical records	19
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	2,509	148
4	485	193
5	477	155
6	533	152
7	743	222
8	868	262
High School	5,273	368
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	2,509	139
4	485	156
5	477	152
6	533	128
7	743	136
8	868	134
High School	5,273	128
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	341
K	197
1	213
2	197
3	169
4	161
5	158
6	151
7	119
8	112
9	121
10	84
11	57
12	35
Ungraded	54
Out-of-school	915
Total	3,084
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky is again experiencing a decrease in student numbers in Category 1, except in the Out of School Youth.

Movement into Kentucky and from school districts reflects workers looking for factory work, construction work and other types of jobs including the horse industry. Kentucky is home to thoroughbred, saddlebred, and harness horses and there are several race tracks throughout the state. Many workers come looking to work with the horses, which is not a qualifying activity. Tobacco and hay are grown on these farms, in addition to the horses, and many workers eventually work with the raising of these seasonal crops. However, the original intent was to look for a specific type of work, which again, does not qualify.

The majority of workers coming into Kentucky are looking for and obtaining non-qualifying work. The intent to seek qualifying work is not evident. Workers are here and doing qualifying work, but did not move to Kentucky with the specific intent of finding qualifying work. Many moved here with the intent of finding work in general and are now doing qualifying work, which in 07-08 does not qualify.

The Out of School Youth population has grown in the 07-08 school year. This is due to a high number of youths that are looking for specific agricultural work, mainly in tobacco, to support themselves and their families back home. The youths do not mind the migratory lifestyle and will follow the seasonal crop timelines in various states.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	110
K	65
1	83
2	90
3	73
4	66
5	69
6	65
7	49
8	52
9	46
10	48
11	21
12	N<10
Ungraded	12
Out-of-school	35
Total	890
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky has experienced a decrease in the Category 2 child count from the previous year.

This is due mainly to the availability of other summer camp and program opportunities being offered in Kentucky (Salvation Army, YMCA, 4H Camps). The students are wanting to be involved in these. Most of the programs and camps overlap during the summer months.

Also, a large portion of students, especially the ungraded and OOS work long hours in the field during the summer months, as these are peak tobacco setting, chopping and topping months.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The system Kentucky used to compile its 2007-2008 Category 1 and Category 2 child count is MIS2000. The 2006-2007 Category 1 and Category 2 child count also used MIS2000.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data collected included all student information: name, sex, birth date, race, birth place, parents' name, student number and the COE number.

Data collected for eligibility were: the QAD (month/day/year), residency date (month/day/year), withdrawal date (month/day/year), and termination date (month/day/year). These were calculated by MIS2000 with qualifying activity and comments provided, if needed.

School information data including the enrollment date (month/date/year), withdrawal date (month/day/year), enrollment type (S for summer school, I for intersession, null for regular school) and attendance data were provided for all children enrolled in school (summer intersession and regular).

Additional data collected was on supplemental programs. The supplemental programs were broken down into 2 categories. The first was Supplemental Instruction: Reading Instruction, Math Instruction and Other Instruction (the remaining content areas). The second category was Supportive Services: Support Services and Referrals.

The Priority for Service Students were broken down into 2 categories. The first was Education Interruption (enrolled in 2 or more schools during the school year, enrolled late in school, or withdrew early from school). The second category was Academically At-Risk: scored novice in Kentucky's CCT math or reading assessment, scored below level in 1 or more areas of the LEP assessment (ACCESS), received grade D or F in math, reading or remaining core content areas in grades 4-12, and an area of concern by the classroom teacher was indicated in math, reading or remaining core content areas for K-3.

Recruiters use a Basic Interview Pattern (BIP) and Certificate of Eligibility (COE) to collect data on students to determine eligibility. Once these two forms are completed, signed, and reviewed again, the forms are sent to the regional clerk for further review. Once they are determined eligible at the regional level, the data is entered in MIS2000.

Beginning in July 2008, Kentucky went from nine to four regions. Each regional clerk entered the data for the 2008 fiscal year all during the year. The data entered from the COE has been described above. A Kentucky Migrant Student Withdrawal Form is used to withdraw each student. This form is used when a child moves out of the school district and/or at the end of the school year. The information on the Withdrawal Form includes: the district name, student's name, withdrawal date, attendance dates, supplemental programs, and secondary credit information on students 9-12. A timeline is provided to the clerks showing the deadline for this regular school information to be July 31. For students participating in the summer/intersession programs, their data is also entered into MIS2000 using a summer/intersession form. The information includes: child's name, school name, withdrawal date, attendance dates, supplemental instruction and support services. This information is entered at the conclusion of the summer project. The timeline shows the deadline for entering this information as 8/31.

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

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

count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information from the COE is entered into MIS2000 by the regional clerks. Once the student COE is determined to be eligible, the information is entered. At the conclusion of each day, an upload process is run. Each student is withdrawn on a Kentucky Migrant Student Withdrawal form. This is used when a child moves out of the school district and/or at the end of the school year. The data that is used was explained the section above. For students participating in the summer/inter-session programs, their information is entered into MIS2000 using a Summer School/Intersession Form. The same data is entered for the regular school year. The clerks receive a timeline to let them know by what date to enter the data.

The inclusion of the Supplemental Instruction and the Support Service Information is supplied for the purpose of a child count at the state level. Supplemental Services include: Reading Instruction, Math Instruction, and Other Instruction. Support Services include: Counseling Service, Support Service, and Referral. It is shown on the form if services were rendered during the regular school year, summer school,

or intersession.

In order to provide updated information for child count purposes, a timeline has been established for clerks. During the months of August and September, enrollment information for the regular school year is due at the clerk's office two weeks after the beginning of school. Continued Residency Verification Signatures must be signed and due in the state office in September.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Students for Category 2 were identified by the MIS2000 system using a query to filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. The dates of 5/15/08 through 8/31/08 were identified for summer school/intersession. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicated enrollment in summer school or intersession. MIS2000 was filtered to pick up either "S" or "I", but not both for funding purposes.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky generated its reports using MIS2000 running queries that filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. Using the dates of 9/1/07 through 8/31/08, MIS2000 developed a report for Kentucky determining the number of students. These reports looked at the QAD being within 36 months of the start date. The termination, withdrawal, residency, QAD and enrollment dates fall between the start and end dates within these reports. MIS2000 calculated these students within the start and end date for the school year.

Students for category 2 were identified by the MIS2000 system using a query to filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. The dates of 5/15/08 through 8/31/08 were for summer school/intersession. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicated enrollment in summer school or intersession. MIS2000 was filtered to pick up either "S" or "I" but not both for funding purposes.

Prior to Mass Enrollment each school year, LEA staff for each MEP program confirm residency for each child. This process ensures that each student was a resident for at least one day during the eligible period. School personnel are consulted beginning the first day of school every year. For students not enrolled in school because of being under school age, a dropout, a special education related reason, home schooled or an emancipated youth, home visits are made at this time. Advocates are in constant contact with their assigned families. Telephone calls are made and/or home visits are scheduled. Any contact with a family member is recorded in the logs kept by these school personnel. School records are reviewed at each grading period for attendance and grades. If at any time they find a student has withdrawn from school, they confirm this by making another home visit or phoning the family. Additionally, employers have even been contacted to confirm this information. Periodically, advocates will tutor students needing additional help with their studies. This also helps to confirm residency within the school district. The migrant families' homes are visited to assist in parenting duties for parents with young children. Out-of-school youth are assisted in various ways. This, too, confirms residency during the eligible period for funding.

The COEs used in Kentucky have an original COE with triplicate copies attached. The original is removed and filed in the regional migrant office. The remaining three copies are maintained in each district migrant office. If the family still resides within the district during the remaining two years of eligibility, a parent signature is obtained one time during each funding year and forwarded to the state office. During the FY08 funding period, due to funding cuts for travel expenses and high gas prices after an initial visit to a migrant family's home, the local MEP personnel could obtain a signature from someone who had physically seen each student listed on the COE. This person's signature would include a comment as to the location and the date each child was last physically seen. If three signatures are obtained (during the 36 months for eligibility), the fourth copy of the COE is returned to the regional migrant office showing all the required signatures that indicate residence within the school district. The student names from the COEs along with the parent signatures are matched with an unduplicated list of students used for the child count to validate residence within Kentucky.

In the case of Category 2, using an MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 5/15/08 -8/31/08 as the start and end dates indicating a child has at least attended one day of summer school or intersession. The report asks that the QAD be within three years of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the end date; the 22nd birth date is greater than the end date; the termination funding withdrawal residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding date; the 3rd birthday is less than the withdrawal date. As a result, the report is designed to locate all children whose eligibility ended before the start dates of summer or intersession services and these are not included in category 2. Summer school is indicated by "S" being placed in the enrollment type and intersession is indicated by "I" being placed in the enrollment type. These students are recipients of MEP-funded services.

To assure students are counted once per category/age/grade, every child is assigned a unique student identification number. When a recruiter has determined a family is eligible for the MEP, he/she knows if the family has been in the program before. If so, the records clerk is informed or from the recruiter's files the unique student number is written on the COE by the child's name. When the clerk receives the COEs before he/she enters the child in MIS2000, a program written into MIS2000 allows the clerk to "search the state database". The clerk will type in the child's name and if the child has been enrolled in any Kentucky district, the name and/or names similar to the child will appear in a listing. The clerk can determine if the list contains the newly enrolled child's name by verifying the birthdate, birthplace, parent's name or the latest school attended.

Once the student is in the MIS2000 system, an on-going procedure is used to ensure that duplicate records are identified and eliminated. Each records clerk will run a "Potential Duplicate Students" report once a month. The Potential Duplicate Students report looks at matching date of birth, close dates of birth, date of birth plus last or first name matching date of birth, first name potentially adopted

duplicates, the same student number and a soundex match (first and/or last names that sound the same). If the clerk finds duplicate students, an e-mail is sent to the state consultant for records clerks. The clerk asks the state consultant to merge the two numbers due to finding duplicate numbers for one student. The student number to be kept is identified and the number to be merged is identified. The state consultant runs the same report as mentioned above once a month. If the state consultant cannot determine which student number to retain, the local migrant projects are consulted and the determination is made there. Once the student with the originally assigned number is determined, the state consultant will merge the numbers. Kentucky is confident that unique identification numbers are assigned for each child. The MIS2000 child counts can determine from selected factors, such as birthplace, parent names, birthplace and student name, and the child will be counted one time for funding purposes. Both the regional records and the state consultant run reports monthly to check for duplication.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's category 2 count was generated using the same system, MIS2000, as was used for the Category 1 count.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To ensure proper verifications of eligibility, Kentucky begins with a standard COE used by all MEP projects. All eligibility determinations are made based upon a personal interview with a parent, guardian, or out-of-school youth. State personnel conduct annual training sessions for all recruiters. Training includes basic eligibility definitions, PMOL, temporary versus seasonal processing, industrial surveys, employment surveys, interviewing techniques (desirable vs. undesirable), timelines for crops and mock interviews. All COEs are reviewed by the records clerk for missing or incomplete information and corrected prior to being given to the regional coordinator for review and signature. Copies of COEs are then sent to the state consultant in charge of recruitment and records where these are reviewed. Any questions regarding the COEs are clarified by discussions with recruiters. If questions cannot be answered to the satisfaction of the state consultant, recruiters are asked to provide additional information or clarification, re-interview the family, or the state consultant tells the family that it does not qualify. The state provides a handbook for recruitment as well as a handbook for training new recruiters. Training on the handbook has been provided to all recruiters either in state and regional sessions and/or on a one-to-one basis. SEA staff randomly check eligibility decisions of recruiters during monitoring visits to local and regional projects through both reviews of original COEs and telephone or face-to-face contacts with families. Regional MEP Coordinators also review random samples of eligibility decisions through telephone or face-to-face interviews with families.

The state consultant randomly selects children who have been reported as attending summer/intersession programs to see if attendance and service codes are being recorded. State migrant consultants observe the instructional content of projects and verify student participation by randomly visiting summer projects.

Kentucky has a process for resolving complaints or issues of any type. This is found in Kentucky Administrative Regulation 704 KAR 3:365 and also in Kentucky's Quality Control Process. This process begins at the regional level. The coordinators must: review the nature of the question or complaint; contact the person raising the question or complaint regarding eligibility; discuss the situation with the recruiter; meet with the family to determine if the eligibility decision was correct; take any necessary corrective action; and notify the state MEP office if the issue cannot be resolved at the local level. Questions or disputes submitted to the state MEP office will be handled in the following manner: the questioner or complainant will be contacted by telephone or in person to gather information about the issue; the appropriate LEA project and school officials will be informed that a question or dispute has been filed with the state office; state staff will meet with the project and school officials to discuss the issue; a preliminary investigation will be conducted to see if there is evidence that the complaint may have validity; further investigation will be conducted if it appears that the complaint has validity based upon preliminary investigation; the LEA project and school officials will be informed in writing of the steps that must be taken for corrective action and for any sanctions; any misidentified children will be removed from MIS2000; refunding of MEP funds from the LEA will be discussed; training and other positive steps will be initiated to ensure the problem will not reoccur; written feedback will be provided to the complainant as to what was found and how the situation has been handled. Effectiveness of recruitment efforts is evaluated during monitoring visits through training sessions with recruiters and through a review of a copy of each COE that is submitted to the state ID&R consultant. Local recruiters complete a District Recruitment Plan and submit this to the state contact for recruiters. This allows the state office to make decisions about needed areas of re-emphasis in the training of recruiters and any revisions that might need to be made to the recruiter handbook or to the handbook for new recruiters. Guidance is annually sent out to regional records clerks concerning collecting and reporting pupil and attendance data.

Annual training is provided to regional records clerks. Additional trainings will be held at regional settings on a one-to-one basis and during monitoring visits concerning all phases of keeping records, inputting data and running reports associated with MIS2000. In addition to the SEA receiving the most recent COE, Kentucky has developed its COE in a triplicate copy format. Between 9/1 and 8/31 of each funding year, a signature is obtained to verify that each child listed on the original COE still resides within the school district. A signature from the parent is the preferred signature; however, the advocate or recruiter may sign the form as well as another employee of the school district. These employees could be a classroom teacher, school principal, etc. If anyone other than the parent signs the Continued Residency Verification form, a comment must be given in the comment section providing the date and location the LEA employee last physically saw the student. Each student must be addressed on this form. This date must be within the funding period of 9/1 through 8/31. For emancipated youth, the preferred signature is the youth themselves. However, an employer's signature is acceptable along with a comment stating when and where the emancipated youth was last physically seen.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This year Kentucky did not hire an outside person to reinterview migrant families. The ID&R coordinator retired in Dec. 2007 and the replacement did not start until May 27, 2008. Therefore, there was no person at the state level to coordinate re-interview efforts. It was left to the regional coordinators to conduct re-interviews within their regions. The regional coordinators pulled every fifth COE to reinterview. Some were done face to face and others were done via telephone. They reinterviewed families within their regions. Any eligibility issues were handled at the regional level, and students deemed ineligible for the program were withdrawn. No data on the results were reported to the state consultant, as there was no person available for half of the year.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Quarterly, the state consultant provides LEAs with student lists to be checked for accuracy. Any changes to be made are made at the regional records clerk level. The clerk is to alert the state consultant about any changes. Periodically, the state consultant will randomly select COEs to be audited. The consultant calls on recruiters and the families from the COEs. Monthly the state consultant uses MIS2000 reports to seek out missing enrollments, withdrawals, birthdates, grade levels, QAD and residency dates, race and sex codes, and facility names and IDs. The clerk is contacted by e-mail for corrections. A file is kept on needed corrections and updated when the corrections are made.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count information is reviewed by the State Director in consultation with the consultant for records/recruitment to make sure that the process of determining that students are unduplicated is accurate in both category 1 and 2. Printouts of counts are double checked to ensure that there is no duplication and that totals are accurate. The printout of every Kentucky student is matched with another printout for students with a new COE during the current funding year or the Continued Residency Verification signatures.

Please understand that there is a new person at the state level and a transition is being experienced.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky was divided into 4 regions beginning July 2008. The regional offices will be a direct arm of the Kentucky Department of Education Migrant Office. A new State ID&R Plan will be in place, as well as Regional ID&R Plans, District ID&R Plans and individual recruiter ID&R Plans. The regional coordinators will be trained yearly on reviewing COE, using a COE checklist. Recruiters will receive more training at the regional level. As new recruiters are hired during the year, two-day trainings will be offered throughout the year, rather than just at the beginning of the year. One-on-one and small group trainings will also be provided as the need arises. In terms of re-interviewing, the regional coordinators will conduct, via random sampling generated from MIS2000, 12-15 COEs from their regions to conduct re-interviews. The SEA will coordinate the random sampling efforts. The regional coordinators will use recruiters from another region to assist their efforts to ensure there is no conflict of interest. When complete, the regional coordinators will send a summary with the defect rate to the SEA. If the defect rate is greater than 5%, there will be corrective actions for that region in order to lower the rate. Some examples of corrective actions include region specific ID&R training and recruiter shadowing. This process will be done for the first

two years. On the third year, an outside source will be under contract to re-interview for the state. The families chosen for this re-interview will also be generated randomly by MIS2000. The re-interview timeline, forms, questions and procedures, created by the SEA, will be used statewide. The SEA will also accompany the regional coordinators on re-interviews on a random basis. If the family is determined to be ineligible, then the SEA will delete that COE from the MIS2000.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At this time, Kentucky does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child count or the eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. With the support of nine (now four) regional coordinators and the regional clerks, the state feels its Quality Control supports the accuracy of this child count. The only issue would be the unfamiliarity of the new migrant consultant with the MIS2000 database when running the child counts.

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