

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 2008-09

KENTUCKY



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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):
Terry Holliday

Friday, March 12, 2010, 11:23:22 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Currently, Kentucky's Program of Studies (revised 2006) represents the minimum required content standards students shall be taught to meet the high school graduation requirements. The passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB1) in 2009 required that content standards in all content areas be revised. The goals of the revision are to have fewer, clearer and higher standards that are internationally benchmarked. Kentucky is working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and other states to develop standards in mathematics, English/language arts and, possibly, science that will be known as the common core standards. As these common core standards in mathematics, English/language arts and science become available, Kentucky plans to replace the currently existing standards with these new, internationally benchmarked ones. According to SB1, all content standards are to be completed and approved by the Kentucky Board of Education no later than December 15, 2010.

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 the assessments and/or academic achievement standards have taken place. Kentucky does plan to adopt new common core standards from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and administer the common core assessments when developed. The passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB1) in 2009 requires that the new state assessments shall be implemented in the 2011-12 academic year.

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 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to the assessments and/or academic achievement standards have taken place. Kentucky does plan to adopt new common core standards from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and administer the common core assessments when developed. The passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB1) in 2009 requires that the new state assessments shall be implemented in the 2011-12 academic year.

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 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 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 ESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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	340,869		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	453		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,774		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	36,067		>97%
Hispanic	9,260		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	284,516		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	47,200		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,485		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	178,689		>97%
Migratory students	1,554		>97%
Male	175,200		>97%
Female	165,658		>97%
Comments: First year LEP students must attempt the test in mathematics but are not assigned a performance level.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	14,081	29.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,351	62.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,692	7.8
Total	47,124	
Comments: Kentucky's identification of students that participate (attempt the test) on the state assessment and the assigning of performance levels are independent of each other. The students that do not participate are assigned the lowest performance level.		

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	345,755		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	457		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,747		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	36,749		>97%
Hispanic	9,407		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	288,411		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,153		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,548		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	182,897		>97%
Migratory students	1,602		>97%
Male	178,156		>97%
Female	167,588		>97%
Comments: First year LEP students are counted as attempting the test for reading but are not assigned a performance level. This is also the reason for the difference in the Asian/Pacific Islander participating vs. performance level counts.			

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 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 (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	14,568	30.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,783	62.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,724	7.8
Total	48,075	
Comments: Kentucky's identification of students that participate (attempt the test) on the state assessment and the assigning of performance levels are independent of each other. The students that do not participate are assigned the lowest performance level.		

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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	143,071		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	186		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,577		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	15,098		>97%
Hispanic	3,575		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	120,078		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,788		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,415		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	72,223		>97%
Migratory students	604		>97%
Male	73,417		>97%
Female	69,648		>97%
Comments: First year LEP students must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level.			

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

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 science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	5,683	30.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,458	61.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,607	8.6
Total	18,748	
Comments: Kentucky's identification of students that participate (attempt the test) on the state assessment and the assigning of performance levels are independent of each other. The students that do not participate are assigned the lowest performance level.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). 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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,615	37,693	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	54	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	608	524	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,434	2,972	54.7
Hispanic	1,596	1,026	64.3
White, non-Hispanic	41,632	32,216	77.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,431	4,481	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,355	806	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,327	18,798	66.4
Migratory students	304	212	69.7
Male	26,115	19,395	74.3
Female	24,496	18,296	74.7
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,615	38,680	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	59	77.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	608	513	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,434	3,145	57.9
Hispanic	1,596	1,082	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	41,632	32,921	79.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,431	4,863	57.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,355	806	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,327	19,536	69.0
Migratory students	304	218	71.7
Male	26,115	19,276	73.8
Female	24,496	19,403	79.2
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers the Science test at the 4th grade; thus, there is no data for grade 3.			

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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,685	35,447	71.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	31	52.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	556	467	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,225	2,783	53.3
Hispanic	1,426	921	64.6
White, non-Hispanic	41,232	30,431	73.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,667	3,815	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,089	637	58.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,471	17,206	62.6
Migratory students	301	192	63.8
Male	25,590	18,178	71.0
Female	24,093	17,268	71.7
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,685	36,850	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	39	66.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	556	457	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,225	2,914	55.8
Hispanic	1,426	959	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	41,232	31,633	76.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,667	4,205	54.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,089	636	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	27,471	18,173	66.2
Migratory students	301	194	64.4
Male	25,590	18,036	70.5
Female	24,093	18,813	78.1
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,685	34,778	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	40	67.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	556	412	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,225	2,247	43.0
Hispanic	1,426	818	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	41,232	30,486	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,667	3,947	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,089	506	46.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,471	16,644	60.6
Migratory students	301	176	58.5
Male	25,590	18,012	70.4
Female	24,093	16,765	69.6
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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 C SPR collection tool.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,357	32,047	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	44	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	502	409	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,168	2,318	44.8
Hispanic	1,445	878	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	41,057	27,712	67.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,301	3,019	41.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	909	417	45.9
Economically disadvantaged students	26,921	14,797	55.0
Migratory students	285	158	55.4
Male	25,136	16,145	64.2
Female	24,220	15,901	65.6
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,357	34,538	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	42	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	502	392	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,168	2,798	54.1
Hispanic	1,445	935	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	41,057	29,630	72.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,301	3,330	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	909	429	47.2
Economically disadvantaged students	26,921	16,373	60.8
Migratory students	285	158	55.4
Male	25,136	16,233	64.6
Female	24,220	18,304	75.6
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers the Science test at the 4th grade; thus, there is no data for grade 5.			

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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,251	31,324	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	34	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	496	415	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,058	2,124	42.0
Hispanic	1,274	717	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	40,357	27,446	68.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,487	2,435	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	789	336	42.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,889	14,077	54.4
Migratory students	211	102	48.3
Male	24,957	15,769	63.2
Female	23,294	15,555	66.8
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,251	32,863	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	34	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	496	383	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,058	2,419	47.8
Hispanic	1,274	762	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	40,357	28,647	71.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,487	2,469	38.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	789	297	37.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,889	14,979	57.9
Migratory students	211	106	50.2
Male	24,957	15,482	62.0
Female	23,294	17,381	74.6
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers the Science test at the 7th grade; thus, there is no data for grade 6.			

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 C SPR collection tool.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,758	30,621	62.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	40	58.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	478	391	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,141	2,038	39.6
Hispanic	1,217	667	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	40,971	26,995	65.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,436	2,046	31.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	669	251	37.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,831	13,283	51.4
Migratory students	188	88	46.8
Male	25,368	15,292	60.3
Female	23,390	15,329	65.5
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,758	31,529	64.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	44	63.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	478	361	75.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,141	2,327	45.3
Hispanic	1,217	693	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	40,971	27,576	67.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,436	2,104	32.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	669	218	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,831	14,080	54.5
Migratory students	188	92	48.9
Male	25,368	14,527	57.3
Female	23,390	17,002	72.7
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,758	30,584	62.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	39	56.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	478	340	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,141	1,765	34.3
Hispanic	1,217	598	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	40,971	27,357	66.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,436	2,279	35.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	669	174	26.0
Economically disadvantaged students	25,831	13,295	51.5
Migratory students	188	92	48.9
Male	25,368	16,074	63.4
Female	23,390	14,510	62.0
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,214	27,146	55.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	40	61.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	475	366	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,264	1,660	31.5
Hispanic	1,241	574	46.2
White, non-Hispanic	41,364	24,133	58.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,189	1,636	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	657	179	27.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,067	10,805	43.1
Migratory students	139	52	37.4
Male	25,383	13,489	53.1
Female	23,831	13,657	57.3
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,214	33,492	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	49	75.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	475	376	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,264	2,750	52.2
Hispanic	1,241	754	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	41,364	29,052	70.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,189	2,050	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	657	218	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,067	14,525	57.9
Migratory students	139	71	51.1
Male	25,383	15,495	61.0
Female	23,831	17,997	75.5
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers the Science test at the 7th grade; thus, there is no data at grade 8.			

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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,432	18,303	41.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	20	34.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	482	336	69.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,712	981	20.8
Hispanic	864	296	34.3
White, non-Hispanic	37,852	16,509	43.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,682	656	14.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	463	95	20.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,784	5,278	28.1
Migratory students	112	33	29.5
Male	22,353	9,083	40.6
Female	22,075	9,219	41.8
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,274	30,469	61.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	62	43	69.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	443	331	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,390	2,385	44.2
Hispanic	983	518	52.7
White, non-Hispanic	41,744	26,831	64.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,637	1,157	20.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	481	131	27.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,949	11,808	51.4
Migratory students	159	81	50.9
Male	25,292	13,616	53.8
Female	23,978	16,851	70.3
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,432	18,316	41.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	21	36.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	482	281	58.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,712	844	17.9
Hispanic	864	274	31.7
White, non-Hispanic	37,852	16,736	44.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,682	772	16.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	463	40	8.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18,784	5,400	28.8
Migratory students	112	39	34.8
Male	22,353	10,140	45.4
Female	22,075	8,175	37.0
Comments: It has been verified that the data is accurate for 2009.			

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.

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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,166	718	61.6
Districts	174	74	42.5
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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	820	578	70.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	768	535	69.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	52	43	82.7
Comments: The goals have increased for meeting AYP and more schools failed to meet AYP.			

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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
174	74	42.5
Comments:		

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	16
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	3
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
Comments:	

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	35
Comments:	

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.

Schools hired School Administrative Managers (SAMs) to support building leadership capacity in the schools. Some SAMs were hired to handle daily managerial duties required of administrators to allow the principals to focus on being an instructional leader of the school. Other schools hired SAMs to be the instructional leader of the school by taking on such tasks as student data collection, review, and analysis. SAMs conducted classroom walk-throughs and reviews of teacher lesson plans and submitted weekly/monthly reports to superintendents. Some schools hired a school council mentor to work with the school-based decision making council. The council mentors provided training for the council members, updated school policies, and provided technical assistance to the school council. Districts with schools in restructuring had assistance teams composed of highly skilled educators, achievement gap coordinators, targeted coaches, state department of education staff, instructional coaches, and district staff. The assistance teams provided leadership support, instructional direction and decision making for the school to help improve student achievement.

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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.

²The 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.

All districts in Kentucky receive Title I funds. Any district in year 3 and 4 of corrective action receives intensive intervention through Assistance Support for School Improvement and Success Teams (ASSIST). Also, Title I districts with the lowest performing schools in the state have been assigned ASSIST teams. Thirty-eight districts have been assigned an intensive intervention ASSIST team for the 09-10 school year. The districts receive services from the ASSIST team as long as the district is in corrective action. When new assessment data is available in the summer of 2010, the ASSIST team assignment will be re-evaluated. The ASSIST teams consist of highly skilled educators (HSE) and/or state level achievement gap coordinators (DAGC), a targeted assistance coach, KDE Title I staff, the district superintendent, the Title I coordinator, and other district leaders. The full ASSIST teams meet at least monthly and make recommendations based on data from across the district. The highly skilled educators, achievement gap coordinator and district staff meet on an on-going basis each month. The districts receive training, participate in job embedded professional development and conduct needs analysis. All districts in improvement or corrective action are required to revise their Comprehensive District Improvement Plan and all districts in corrective action must submit a Corrective Action Plan to the Kentucky Department of Education. In addition, all districts in corrective action are required to reserve Title I funds at the district level to carry out the recommendations of the ASSIST team and the Corrective Action plans.

Districts in the first and second year of corrective action receive collaborative support from the regional educational cooperatives and Kentucky Department of Education. Districts in improvement and corrective action are also required to attend school improvement trainings at the state level along with the state highly skilled educators, achievement gap coordinators and targeted intervention coaches. The trainings are provided to address identified needs for improving student achievement.

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	17
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	4
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	17
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	1
Restructured the district	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	12/14/09
---	----------

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	45,394	48,349
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	23,304	22,930
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	51.3	47.4
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	46,289	48,910
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	27,233	28,067
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 2008-09	58.8	57.4
Comments:		

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

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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	28
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	28
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	86
Comments: There were actually 38 schools that exited improvement status. 24 of those 38 exited because of redistricting.	

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

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 based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, 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	1, 2, 3, 4, & 5. Retired teachers and other "experts" were used to supplement math and science instruction with the majority of the funds. The Thinklink assessment tool was used in both math and reading. BuckleDown was purchased as supplemental material in reading and math, and Study Island was purchased for reading. 1) SREB High Schools that Work and Making Middle Grades Work reform model 2) Creating the Learning Centered School (Mike Rutherford) 4) The Assist Team Model from KDE	56	4	3	A	

	Assistant Manager provided technical assistance to principals as they worked with teams of teachers in their buildings on data analysis, formative assessment, and targeting at-risk students. Double math classes were implemented to divide the math content so students would have more time to learn. All students received a reading class each day at school that focused on the five components of reading. SAMS were hired at schools to handle non-instructional duties.					
5		20	8	7	A	
3	N/A	7	1	0	A	
4	N/A	8	2	3	A	
1	N/A	16	0	0		
2	N/A	11	0	1	A	

Comments:

Column 1 Response Options Box

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Many highly skilled educators, achievement gap coordinators and targeted intervention coaches are assigned to multiple districts/schools. This allows for networking and sharing of successful strategies between districts and schools. The state level school improvement trainings and highly skilled educator cadre meetings allow for sharing of effective strategies at the meetings. Districts/schools are identified as implementing effective strategies and allow for site visits from other districts. All districts in corrective action were required to attend two state-level conferences. The conferences included: training by Dr. Anthony Muhammad on turning around low-performing schools; Elliott Merribloom on master scheduling; and sessions on root cause analysis. Educational cooperatives also provide trainings (educational rounds) for districts identified for improvement.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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.

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

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 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During SY 08-09, all schools and districts in the second year of corrective action received a scholastic audit. The scholastic audits are an intensive review of nine standards that include: curriculum; assessment; instruction; school culture; student, family and community support; professional development, growth and evaluation; leadership; organizational structure and resources; and comprehensive and effective planning.

Districts and schools in corrective action in the 08-09 school year also received services from ASSIST teams. The ASSIST teams in 08-09 included school-based decision making council mentors and principal mentors. The ASSIST teams provided guidance and assistance in developing the corrective action plans and monitored progress of implementation and effectiveness of the plan. Each ASSIST team submitted a monthly report to Kentucky Department of Education. The reports were reviewed by KDE staff members to monitor and evaluate goals, progress toward meeting the goals, improvement of student achievement, staff development and identified technical assistance needs.

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

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 2008-09 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.

Any Title I schools identified for Title I improvement that were also identified for state assistance based on the state assessment were provided a scholastic audit and an ASSIST team.

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

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	60,434
Applied to transfer	1,102
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	370

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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 926,735

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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	16

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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 school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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	34,886
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,736
Received supplemental educational services	3,773
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	\$ 5,061,340
Comments:	

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	180,727	178,571	98.8	2,156	1.2
All elementary classes	76,359	76,022	99.6	337	0.4
All secondary classes	104,368	102,549	98.3	1,819	1.7

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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.

This is determined by the local school district.
--

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 is 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 the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

In the tables 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	1.0
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	74.0
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.

	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)	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	50.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	35.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	18,298	18,219	99.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	18,628	18,584	99.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	14,447	14,162	98.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	33,727	33,344	98.9

1.5.4 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	45.0
Poverty metric used	The KY Department of Education determines this number by using free/reduced lunch data, dividing the total number of elementary schools by 4, and the low and high quartiles are determined for all schools via the same formula.	
Secondary schools	68.0	40.0
Poverty metric used	The KY Department of Education determines this number by using free/reduced lunch data, dividing the total number of secondary schools by 4, and the low and high quartiles are determined for all schools via the same formula.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(vii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
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 programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	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.

Some districts have Newcomer Centers for middle and high school English Language Learners.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	14,589
Comments:	

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 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.	13,481
Comments:	

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; Castilian	8,879
Uncoded languages	1,017
Japanese	536
Chinese	397
Bosnian	390

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the 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	14,461
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	124
Total	14,585
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,690
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	11.6
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,363
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	115
Total	13,478
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	4,862

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	3,714	27.6	3,519	50.00
ELP attainment	1,581	11.7	431	3.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 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
517	170	687
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
611	492	80.5	119
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of 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 1.6.3.6.3 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
609	517	84.9	92
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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
213	160	75.1	53
Comments:			

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	31
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	27
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	31
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	31
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	27
# -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 2007-08 and 2008-09)	3
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	3
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	1
Comments:	

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:	

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:	

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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
5,616	5,599	10

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 ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts 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 under 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.	137
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	500

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.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	93	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	113	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	56	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	51	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	86	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	60	1,825
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	85	456
PD provided to principals	51	360
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	26	230
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	51	418
PD provided to community based organization personnel	15	83
Total	288	3,372

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/08	9/11/09	52
Comments:		

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 number of days for distribution of Title III funds to subgrantees if the state received its allocation sooner from the U.S. Department of Education.

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	
Comments: Kentucky had 0 schools that were identified as Persistently Dangerous in 2008-09.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.5
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.

Kentucky requested and received an extension from USED concerning the 2011 deadline for reporting the cohort graduation rate. Kentucky will track first time 9th graders beginning with the 2009-10 cohort until they graduate four years later in 2013. Kentucky will report the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR) as the transitional graduation rate from 2010 through 2012. Kentucky will collect 2013 graduate data in the fall of 2013 and report the 2013 four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate beginning in the fall of 2013.

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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	4.1
White, non-Hispanic	2.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	2.6
Female	1.9
Comments: Some subgroup data is not currently available since the student level data collection system has not been fully implemented.	

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:		

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)	683	712
K	840	707
1	855	946
2	713	838
3	717	936
4	710	995
5	655	1,151
6	500	855
7	528	1,191
8	565	1,034
9	557	1,664
10	488	1,214
11	445	838
12	579	710
Ungraded		
Total	8,835	13,791
Comments:		

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	1,401	3,717
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,526	7,951
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	431	2,001
Hotels/Motels	477	122
Total	8,835	13,791
Comments:		

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)	712
K	707
1	946
2	838
3	936
4	995
5	1,151
6	855
7	1,191
8	1,034
9	1,664
10	1,214
11	838
12	710
Ungraded	
Total	13,791
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	1,042
Migratory children/youth	63
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	840
Limited English proficient students	44
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 ESEA 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 ESEA.

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	425	425
4	330	330
5	331	331
6	282	282
7	276	276
8	316	316
High School	279	279
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 ESEA 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	395	395
4	309	309
5	333	333
6	236	236
7	209	209
8	213	213
High School	128	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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	463
K	191
1	199
2	172
3	158
4	133
5	118
6	143
7	106
8	98
9	94
10	80
11	47
12	19
Ungraded	61
Out-of-school	1,023
Total	3,105
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 experienced an increase in the number of students by .7%. The OSY population has slightly increased in Kentucky. Research done by the state office indicated that this is due to a statewide increase of H2A Visa workers.

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	171
K	79
1	91
2	89
3	90
4	72
5	61
6	60
7	67
8	48
9	43
10	31
11	25
12	N<10
Ungraded	16
Out-of-school	66
Total	1,017
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 experienced an increase in the Category 2 number of students from the previous school year. The increase is about 1.5%. The increase is due to several reasons. First, more LEAs were offering summer programming for migrant students. Second, each regional office conducted a summer camp and third, the SEA was able to offer grants to LEAs that wanted to offer innovative summer programs, enticing LEAs to sponsor stimulating summer programs that attracted more migrant students.

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 uses to compile its 2008-2009 Category 1 and Category 2 child count is MIS2000. The 2007-2008 Category 1 and Category 2 child count was also compiled using MIS2000.

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, birthplace, parents'/guardians' names, current address, phone number, student number and COE number.

The 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 entered and/or calculated by MIS2000 with the qualifying activity and comments provided, if needed.

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

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

The Priority for Services were broken down into two categories. The first was Educational Interruption (enrolled in 2 or more schools during the regular school year, enrolled late in school or withdrew early from school). The second category was Academically At-Risk: scored novice on categories CCT math or ready assessment, scored below level in one 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. The BIP predetermines eligibility before the COE categories go out and establishes a migrant history, if applicable. Kentucky began using a Kentucky-specific National COE at the start of the 09-10 school year. All districts were using the new COE by August 18, 2009. Once these two forms are completed, reviewed by the recruiter, signed and reviewed by someone else in the district office, they are sent to the regional office for further review. Once they are determined eligible at the regional level, the data are entered in MIS2000.

Kentucky has 4 regional offices, each with a coordinator and clerk. Each regional clerk enters the data for the 2009 fiscal year continuously during the year. The data entered from the COE have been described above. A Kentucky Migrant Student Withdrawal Form is used to withdraw each student. This is used when a student moves out of the school district and/or at the end of the school year. The information on the Withdrawal Form includes: district name, student's name, withdrawal date, attendance dates, supplemental programs and secondary credit information on students in grades 9-12. A timeline is provided to the clerks showing the deadline for this regular school information submission to be July 31. For students participating in the summer/intersession programs, their data are also entered into MIS2000 using a summer/intersession form. The information includes: student's name, school name, 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 August 31.

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 a student COE is determined to be eligible by the regional office, the information is entered. At the conclusion of each day, an upload process is run. This is also done with the MSIX database. Each night an upload is done into MSIX, updating it with any new Kentucky information.

As mentioned above, each student is withdrawn using a Kentucky Withdrawal Form. This is used when a student moves out of the district and/or at the end of the school year. The data used on the withdrawal form are explained in the section above. For students participating in the summer/intersession programs, their information is entered into MIS2000 using a Summer School/Intersession Form. The same data are entered for the regular school year. The clerks receive a yearly timeline to let them know by what date to enter the data.

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

In order to provide updated information for child count purposes, a timeline has been established for regional office clerks. During the

months of August and September, enrollment information for the regular school year is due at the regional 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.

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 5/15/09 -08/01/09 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.

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 9/1/08 through 8/31/09, MIS2000 developed a report for Kentucky determining the number of students. The report 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 in the report. MIS2000 calculated these students within the start date 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 5/15/09 through 8/01/09 were used 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 the MEP project 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 school or 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 viewed 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, the 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. This is the last year for this. The new national COE Kentucky began using 8/15/09 does not use triplicates. 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 to forward to the state office. However, due to budget cuts across the state and district travel restrictions, 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 dates 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 the unduplicated list of students used for the child count to validate residence within Kentucky.

In the case of Category 2, using a MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 5/15/09-8/01/09 as the start and end dates indicating a child has at least attended 1 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 birth date is greater than the funding date; and 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 received the COEs before he/she enters the child into MIS2000, a program written into MIS2000 allows the clerk to "search the 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 will appear in a listing. The clerk can determine if the list contains any newly enrolled child's name by verifying the birth date, birth place, parent's name or the latest school attended.

Once a student is entered 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 match 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 student numbers/records 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 from there. Once a student with the 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.

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 identification of eligibility, Kentucky begins with a standard COE used by all MEP projects. As of August 15, 2009, all MEP objects began to use the Kentucky specific national COE. All MEP personnel were trained on the new COE during the summer 2009 via regional sessions. All eligibility determinations are made based upon a personal interview with the parent, guardian, or out-of-school youth. State personnel conduct annual training sessions for all recruiters. Training includes basic eligibility definitions, temporary versus seasonal processing, employment surveys, interviewing techniques (desirable vs. undesirable), timeline for crops, mock interviews and how to properly fill out the paperwork. 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 the COE are then sent to the state consultant in charge of recruitment and records where these are reviewed. Any questions regarding 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 they do not qualify. The state provides a handbook for recruitment (that will be updated pending the release of the final guidance) as well as a handbook for training new recruiters. Training has been provided to all recruiters either in state and regional sessions and/or on a one-on-one basis. SEA staff will 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. SEA staff will also ride along with local and regional recruiters on recruiting visits to ensure quality recruiting practices. 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 regional 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 Plan and submit this to the regional and state office. 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-on-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 format (the new national COE does not use triplicates, which went into effect 8/15/2009). 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, a 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 and 8/31. For emancipated youth, the preferred signature is the actual youth. However, an employer's signature is acceptable along with a comment stating when and where the emancipated youth was last physically seen. On the new COE, the recruiter just makes a copy of the original COE to retain a Continued Residency signature and sends a copy to the regional office, which then forwards a copy to the state office.

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.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has cooperated with the regional migrant offices to carry out re-interviews for federal compliance and quality control beginning in 2009. Every third year the re-interviews will be conducted by an outside entity. The re-interviews need to be completed by the end of October of each year.

1 The regional clerk will run the random student sample report from MIS2000 to generate a random computerized list of students from that region. Assistance will be given from the state MEP if necessary.

2 The formula used to determine a random student sample for re-interview is as follows:

1 Under random student sample report -enter the region code and how many names to generate (20-25 per region).

2 Enter the date range 9/1/2007 -present (for 2009).

3 The computerized list will identify the record for year re-interviews.

4 The regional office contacts families to schedule re-interview dates and times. If a family is not available for a re-interview, the regional office will document the efforts that were made to contact the family on the Re-interview Contact Denial Form and proceed to the next student on the sample list.

5 The regional office will determine which recruiters can facilitate the re-interviews. The original recruiter cannot conduct the re-interview, although he/she can attend to put the family at ease.

6 The findings will be documented during the re-interview with the family on the Kentucky MEP Re-interview Form.

7 The regional office sends the re-interview results to the State MEP office to be examined.

8 If, through the re-interview process, the child/children is/are verified to be eligible for the Kentucky MEP, the state MEP will notify the regional office of these findings.

9 If, through the re-interview process, the child/children is/are found to have been misidentified and ineligible for the Kentucky MEP, the state MEP will notify the regional office of these findings; AND the regional office must contest re-interviewing findings within 30 days of notification, documenting their efforts on the Contesting Re-interview Findings Form.

10 Should the regional office decide to interview the family again, the interview should be done by someone other than the original recruiter, which may include state MEP staff.

11 If the regional office cannot provide sufficient written evidence to successfully contest the re-interview findings within 30 days of notification the state MEP will VOID that child's COE.

12 The state MEP will send a memo to the regional office confirming that the child's COE information has been voided from MIS2000.

13 The regional office and state MEP office will retain copies of the re-interview paperwork to serve as verification to USDOE/OME that Kentucky has implemented a re-interview process according to regulation CFR200.89. A defect rate for the year will also be generated from these results.

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 regional offices provides LEAs with student lists to be checked for accuracy. Any changes are made at the regional clerk's level. The clerk is to alert the state consultant about any changes. Periodically, the state consultant and regional coordinators will randomly select COEs to be audited. The consultant and coordinators call on families from the COEs. Monthly, the state consultant uses MIS2000 reports to seek out missing enrollments, withdrawals, birth dates, 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.

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.

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.

Individual Corrective Actions/Improvements:

The Kentucky MEP will continue to offer yearly recruiter trainings as well as one-on-one trainings to newly hired recruiters. The regional offices will offer professional development sessions at regional meetings. When possible, the ID&R coordinator will attend regional meetings and hold mini-trainings and provide guidance. The ID&R coordinator has shadowed several new recruiters. The state has also paired new recruiters to experienced recruiters for on-the-job training. In October, Kentucky held a recruiting blitz in the Western Region (Region A) that brought together 7 recruiters from varying experience levels together to work with local districts/recruiters as well as districts without programs. Three more recruiting blitzes are planned using the same format.

Each regional office employs at least one regional recruiter. The regional coordinator and ID&R coordinator consult on which local recruiters can benefit from one-on-one job assistance and the regional recruiter is sent there. When available the state ID&R coordinator accompanies the regional recruiter.

Regional Corrective Actions/Improvements:

Corrective Action Plan for defect rates higher than 5% -Year 1 defect rate: 6%-10%

CORRECTIVE ACTION: Region specific training for recruiters with state ID&R coordinator occurs. Each recruiter will complete a recruitment plan that will be monitored at the regional and state level. The recruiter will shadow experienced recruiters. The recruiter will be required to attend trainings regardless of years of experience.

Year 2 defect rate: 5%-9%

CORRECTIVE ACTION: Each recruiter will be required to attend trainings and professional development regardless of years of experience.

One-on-one training with state ID&R coordinator and/or regional coordinator occurs. The recruitment plan will be directly monitored by the state ID&R coordinator.

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 four regional coordinators and clerks, the state feels the Quality Control supports the accuracy of this child count.