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:

- o Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- o Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- o Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- o Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- o Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- o Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- o Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- o 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-HLP-EDEN (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 X 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

Tuesday, April 20, 2010, 10:04:10 AM

Signature Date

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	37,316	27,304	73.2
4	36,328	25,376	69.8
5	36,612	23,036	62.9
6	25,873	16,057	62.1
7	23,994	14,202	59.2
8	24,548	12,632	51.5
High School	6,619	2,132	32.2
Total	191,290	120,739	63.1
Comments:			

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	37,316	27,998	75.0
4	36,328	26,409	72.7
5	36,612	25,007	68.3
6	25,873	17,011	65.8
7	23,994	14,872	62.0
8	24,548	16,179	65.9
High School	7,719	4,234	54.8
Total	192,390	131,710	68.5
Comments:			

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	3,341	2,581	77.2
4	3,435	2,565	74.7
5	3,173	2,265	71.4
6	1,997	1,440	72.1
7	1,875	1,322	70.5
8	1,871	1,226	65.5
High School	353	112	31.7
Total	16,045	11,511	71.7
Comments:			

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	3,341	2,727	81.6
4	3,435	2,726	79.4
5	3,173	2,421	76.3
6	1,997	1,474	73.8
7	1,875	1,313	70.0
8	1,871	1,378	73.6
High School	336	191	56.8
Total	16,028	12,230	76.3
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SW or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student <u>only once</u> in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do <u>not</u> include the following individuals:
(1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	55,671
Limited English proficient students	11,024
Students who are homeless	8,130
Migratory students	1,532
Comments:	

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do <u>not</u> include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	416
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,534
Black, non-Hispanic	41,574
Hispanic	11,073
White, non-Hispanic	252,648
Total	308,245
Comments:	

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the underlined number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	N<10	363	N<10	N<10	363
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	12,259	N<10	N<10	12,260
K	170	34,690	120	N<10	34,980
1	567	34,820	230	11	35,628
2	816	34,534	237	19	35,606
3	768	35,480	199	37	36,484
4	620	32,871	180	31	33,702
5	375	32,442	146	42	33,005
6	128	24,547	73	68	24,816
7	160	21,908	61	69	22,198
8	105	22,357	40	96	22,598
9	N<10	8,221	24	209	8,454
10	N<10	7,415	N<10	127	7,542
11	N<10	6,343	N<10	111	6,454
12	N<10	6,071	N<10	52	6,126
Ungraded	N<10	18,281	N<10	N<10	18,281
TOTALS	3,709	332,602	1,314	872	338,497
Comments:					

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	945
Reading/language arts	2,975
Science	48
Social studies	53
Vocational/career	13
Other instructional services	72
Comments:	

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	
Supporting guidance/advocacy	
Other support services	
Comments:	

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	69	
Paraprofessionals[1]	33	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]		
Clerical support staff		
Administrators (non-clerical)		
Comments: This report was completed and sent to pre-populate the CSPR. The other paraprofessionals and clerical support staff answers should both be zeroes.		

[1] Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2). [2] Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	910.80	100.0
Comments:		

[3] Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	9
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means
   enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	189
2. Adults participating	196
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	48
4. Participating children	258
a. Birth through 2 years	81
b. Ages 3 through 5	97
c. Ages 6 through 8	60
c. Above age 8	20
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and reenrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	154
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	160
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	147
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	135
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	66
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	19
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	48
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	97
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	25
5. Total families enrolled	189
Comments:	

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

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined at the State level either by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance Indicators.

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	90	68	
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	N<10	N<10	
BEST	34	25	
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
Other			
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<10	N<10	
GED	N<10	N<10	
Other			
Comments:			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED	31	28	
Other			
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	55	45	40	N<10	
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments: The three exempted children had disabilities.					

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

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	55	45	34	N<10	
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a <u>weighted</u> average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	55	46	N<10	16.7	
Comments: The three exempted children had disabilities.					

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

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	15	15	
1	17	17	
2	13	13	
3	N<10	N<10	
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	129	112	
PEP Scale II	118	99	
PEP Scale III	14	14	
PEP Scale IV	14	14	
Other	21	21	POG
Comments:			

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

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data of migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs in section 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	259
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	3,364

Comments: This data is certified to have come from MIS2000, the migrant database that Kentucky uses. The 5th, 9th, and 12th grade levels have experiencedÂ decreases from the previous year (25%, 22%, and 45%) and this is a result of several factors. First, there was a large number of 4th, 8th, and 11th graders that reached EOE (78, 62, and 20) during the 2007-2008 school year and therefore would not show up on the 2008-2009 eligibile migrant children child count, unless they moved to another district in Kentucky. Another factor is students moving to the Ungraded (UG) category. This would include students who may have moved to districts that do not have a local program (causing them to be served from the regional office), may be in special education, may be working on a GED, or may be in a transistional program. Finally, the decrease can come from their migratory lifestyle. Overall, Kentucky is seeing a decrease in K-12 students while the Pre-K and OSY numbers are increasing.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	29
1	22
2	24
3	N<10
4	24
5	18
6	28
7	17
8	18
9	13
10	11
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	230
Comments: This information has been verified to have come from MIS2000, the migrant student database that Kentucky uses.	

FAQ on priority for services:
Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State''s challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, <u>and</u> whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	20
K	59
1	65
2	56
3	25
4	36
5	18
6	32
7	15
8	19
9	16
10	15
11	10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	395
Comments: This data is certified to have come from MIS2000, the migrant database that Kentucky uses.	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	22
K	21
1	18
2	14
3	18
4	16
5	21
6	19
7	16
8	N<10
9	21
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	210
Comments: This data is certified to have come from MIS2000, the migrant database that Kentucky uses. The blank indicates a zero.	

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	131	96	30	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	146	168	91	58
K	59	68	31	33
1	58	58	39	44
2	40	59	36	37
3	45	43	28	42
4	35	40	28	30
5	31	37	26	24
6	31	51	34	27
7	23	40	20	23
8	33	25	19	21
9	25	26	22	21
10	13	29	13	25
11	N<10	13	10	16
12	N<10	N<10	N<10	10
Ungraded	10	N<10	22	N<10
Out-of-school	363	413	129	82
Total	1,054	1,177	579	501

Comments: This data is certified to have come from MIS2000, the migrant database that Kentucky uses and submitted in file N121 for EDEN reporting. However, the CSPR report that pulls this specific information shows different numbers for the first two columns than what was submitted via EDEN. The migrant data person in Kentucky has notified MIS2000 of the inconsistency and has been working with them on troubleshooting and fixing the problem. The CSPR report gives the follwing for the first two columns, which is more in line with Kentucky's Migrant Population:
12 Months Previous
13-24 months birth-2 127 64
3-5 169 116
K 86 63
1 77 61
2 58 47
3 61 50
4 52 36
5 50 38
6 36 38
7 44 46
8 39 33
9 33 20
10 22 30
11 16 12
12 N<10 **13**
UG 24 11
OS 603 391
TOTAL 1502 1069

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the underlined number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	257
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	411
K	160
1	158
2	138
3	116
4	107
5	96
6	117
7	85
8	79
9	73
10	56
11	32
12	N<10
Ungraded	61
Out-of-school	906
Total	2,861
Comments: This data is certified to have come from MIS2000, the migrant database that Kentucky uses. The increase from the previous year could be due to the increase Kentucky experienced in eligibile migrant students for the 08-09 school year. However, as mentioned in the previous section, some reports are experiencing data inconsistencies in the database. This section is one of those. The CSPR report that pulls this specific information shows a different number than what was submitted via EDEN 121. The CSPR report gives data more consistent with Kentucky's numbers. The CSPR numbers are below: birth -2 111 3-5 249 K 124 1 139 2 108 3 102 4 99 5 83 6 76 7 108 8 67 9 54 10 55 11 30 12 24 UG 37 OS 674 TOTAL 2140	

2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migrant students.

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	
Comments: The assessment and accountablility division reports this information. However, the federal programs division (where the migrant function resides) tracks this information and the assessment and accountablility does not. The data manager for migrant has requested that the correct migrant data (pulled from MIS2000) be submitted. According to MIS2000, the migrant database, the correct numbers are: Grade Count **7** N<10 **8** N<10 **9** N<10 **10** N<10 **11** N<10 **12** N<10 **UG** N<10 **TOTAL 10**	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your state	N<10
Comments: Tis number is verified by MIS2000, the Kentucky Migrant database. The KY Migrant Program has seen an increase in Out-of-School Youth, which in turn has led to an increase in people obtaining their GEDs. The advocates and recruiters have been diligent in helping migrant students to finish their education.	

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	306	305
4	303	303
5	286	284
6	216	215
7	189	189
8	142	142
9		
10	160	160
11		
12		
Total	1,602	1,598
Comments: This testing data comes from the division of assessment and accountablility. The division of federal programs (where the migrant function resides) does not submit this data; therefore, this data is not certified. Federal programs pulls its data from MIS2000, the certified migrant database. Assessment and accountablility pulls its data from Inifnite Campus (IC), the statewide student information system. It is very likely that migrant children are misidentified in Infinite Campus by the local school districts. As a result, the data is different in MIS2000 and IC. Again, the migrant data manager does not certify this information as it is not submitted by the division under which Migrant falls. We are working to correct the inconsistency.		

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	306	305
4	303	303
5	286	284
6	216	215
7	189	189
8	142	142
9		
10		
11	112	112
12		
Total	1,554	1,550
Comments: This testing data comes from the division of assessment and accountablility. The division of federal programs (where the migrant function resides) does not submit this data; therefore, this data is not certified. Federal programs pulls its data from MIS2000, the certified migrant database. Assessment and accountablility pulls its data from Inifnite Campus (IC), the statewide student information system. It is very likely that migrant children are misidentified in Infinite Campus by the local school districts. As a result, the data is different in MIS2000 and IC. Again, the migrant data manager does not certify this information as it is not submitted by the division where Migrant is located. We are working to correct this inconsistency.		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

<u>Unless otherwise indicated</u>, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do <u>not</u> include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds <u>were</u> consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the regular school year. Do <u>not</u> include:

● Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	259
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	463
K	190
1	199
2	171
3	158
4	133
5	118
6	143
7	106
8	98
9	94
10	80
11	47
12	19
Ungraded	43
Out-of-school	1,019
Total	3,340

Comments: This information is certified as having come from MIS2000, the migrant student database that Kentucky uses. However, the information sumitted via EDEN N123 does not match CSPR reports that are run from the same system, MIS2000. An investigation is currently being conducted into why the vast difference is occuring. According to the CSPR report specific to this data query, the data are:
Age birth through 2 N<10
Age 3 through 5 61
 K 126
1 136
2 123
3 106
4 88
5 78
6 93
7 71
8 53
9 67
10 54
11 26
12 18
UG **N<10**
OS **N<10**
TOTAL 1115

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the underlined number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	N<10
K	29
1	22
2	24
3	N<10
4	24
5	18
6	28
7	17
8	18
9	13
10	11
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	230
Comments: This information is certified as having come from MIS2000, the migrant database for Kentucky. Kentucky reviewed and changed its definition of PFS to meet the federal regulations and better identify which students are PFS; thus, this caused a change in the numbers.	

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65
K	119
1	134
2	108
3	102
4	85
5	70
6	95
7	66
8	57
9	59
10	51
11	26
12	16
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,063
Comments: Kentucky has ensured that these data were collected in order to meet federal data requirements. Therefore, there is a large increase from last year's number of 0. This information is certified as having come from MIS2000, the migrant database.	

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:
What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are <u>not</u> *considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would* <u>not</u> *be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.*

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by <u>either a teacher or a paraprofessional</u>. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	65
1	75
2	76
3	65
4	53
5	42
6	45
7	34
8	28
9	23
10	29
11	14
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	590
Comments: This information is certified as having come from MIS2000, the Kentucky migrant student database.	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by <u>a teacher only</u>. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	N<10		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	26	15	
K	56	48	
1	60	53	
2	62	55	
3	53	45	
4	44	41	
5	33	27	
6	33	30	
7	25	23	
8	19	18	
9	17	15	55
10	24	20	53
11	12	12	26
12	N<10	N<10	10
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	
Total	474	406	144

Comments: This information is certified as having come from MIS2000, the Kentucky migrant student database. All information is provided via a data query. Kentucky is aware of an inconsistency between what is submitted to EDEN and the same report pulled to verify CSPR numbers. Kentucky is investigating the root of the problem in order to fix it. When a CSPR report for this information is run, the following numbers for High School Credit Accrual result:
9 22
10 18
11 N<10
12 N<10
UG N<10
OS N<10
TOTAL 49 These data are consistent with the other data pulled from the EDEN N145 file. Again, it is currently being investigated as to why there is a gap in the reported data from reports that collect the same data.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:
What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a <u>teacher</u> for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the underlined number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the underlined number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	60	N<10
K	105	12
1	104	21
2	87	13
3	75	14
4	61	13
5	57	N<10
6	81	12
7	53	N<10
8	51	N<10
9	50	N<10
10	46	N<10
11	25	N<10
12	14	N<10
Ungraded	N<10	
Out-of-school	N<10	
Total	877	133
Comments: This information is certified as having come from MIS2000, the Kentucky migrant student database.		

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. <u>Do not include children who were referred, but received no services</u>. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: The CSPR report pulled from MIS2000, the migrant data base, gives the following for this data query: **age birth through 2** N<10 **age 3 through 5(not K) 46** **K 79** **1 98** **2 85** **3 72** **4 58** **5 54** **6 61** **7 37** **8 39** **9 34** **10 35** **11 17** **12 10** **UG** N<10 **OS** N<10 **TOTAL 737**	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the underlined number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	24
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133
K	65
1	71
2	71
3	67
4	52
5	40
6	52
7	55
8	40
9	35
10	30
11	20
12	N<10
Ungraded	19
Out-of-school	71
Total	852
Comments: The data is certified through MIS2000.	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	N<10
K	N<10
1	12
2	14
3	16
4	N<10
5	14
6	N<10
7	19
8	10
9	12
10	11
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	136

Comments: The data that has been collected are not showing up on the EDEN report. The PFS summer numbers, coming from MIS2000, are as follows:
3-5 N<10
K N<10
1 12
2 14
3 16
4 N<10
5 14
6 N<10
7 19
8 10
9 13
10 11
11 N<10
12 N<10
UG N<10
TOTAL 136

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

Comments: These data show up as 0 on EDEN 124 reports but show numbers on CSPR reports pulled from MIS2000, the migrant database. As previously mentioned, this issue is being investigated to find a workable solution. The actual data from this section are:

3-5 N<10
K N<10
1 N<10
2 N<10
3 N<10
4 N<10
5 N<10
6 N<10
7 N<10
8 N<10
9 N<10
10 N<10
11 N<10
12 N<10
UG N<10
OS N<10
TOTAL 10

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:
What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are NOT *considered* services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the underlined number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	30
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	128
K	67
1	70
2	71
3	67
4	52
5	39
6	52
7	55
8	39
9	33
10	30
11	20
12	N<10
Ungraded	18
Out-of-school	53
Total	830
Comments: This is certifed to have come from MIS2000, the migrant database and is correct.	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	28	11	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	119	99	
K	66	55	
1	68	52	
2	66	56	
3	67	57	
4	49	43	
5	39	34	
6	50	42	
7	53	48	
8	38	36	
9	32	27	
10	27	21	
11	18	15	
12	N<10	N<10	
Ungraded	16	18	
Out-of-school	52	20	
Total	794	639	
Comments: This is certified to be correct and as having come from MIS2000, the migrant database.			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:
What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received <u>any</u> MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	12	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	102	N<10
K	57	N<10
1	54	N<10
2	58	N<10
3	55	N<10
4	35	N<10
5	33	N<10
6	40	N<10
7	44	
8	26	
9	23	N<10
10	24	N<10
11	15	
12	N<10	N<10
Ungraded	14	
Out-of-school	38	N<10
Total	636	21
Comments: This is certified as accurate and as having come from MIS2000, the migrant database.		

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*

b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. <u>Do not include children who were referred, but received no services</u>. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

Comments: This is another inconsistency in our reporting database. The CSPR report for these data provides the following numbers:
age birth through 2 N<10
age 3 through 5(notK) 43
K 15
1 19
2 26
3 27
4 18
5 11
6 16
7 16
8 10
9 10
10 N<10
11 N<10
12 N<10
UG 21
OS 20
TOTAL 276

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do <u>not</u> count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	259
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	463
K	188
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	43
Out-of-school	1,019
Total	3,339

Comments: This is another report that is showing an inconsistency in numbers. The above numbers are verified as coming from MIS2000 for EDEN X054. However, the CSPR report for the same infomation shows numbers more consistent with the percent of increase in student numbers from the previous school year. Those numbers are:
Birth through 2 N<10
3 through 5(not K) 275
K 136
1 137
2 130
3 124
4 99
5 78
6 97
7 90
8 75
9 71
10 61
11 33
12 23
UG 62
OS 684
TOTAL 2179
Kentucky has experienced an increase in serving migrant children due to the increase in number of eligible migrant children present across the state in the 2008-2009 school year. More children enrolled in the program will logically lead to more children receiving MEP services. The recruiters and advocates have also been trained on the Service Delivery Plan and are attending workshops and conferences that emphasize methods and strategies for serving students, which are also focused on by Migrant Staff. These methods and strategies lead to an increase in the number of students being served.

2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migrant children at any time during the <u>regular school year</u>. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	322
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	2,003
Comments: This is verified as having come from MIS2000, the migrant database.	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the <u>regular school year</u>. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	183
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	1,319
Comments: This is verified as having come from MIS2000, the migrant database.	

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant <u>and</u> provides services directly to the migrant child. Do <u>not</u> include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children participating in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	0	0
Regular school year – school day/extended day	24	919
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	48	3,371
Comments: The information was given and verified by regional coordinators and the state director.		

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*

b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*

c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*

d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*

e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	0.75
Comments: This was verified by the State Director of the KYMEP.	

FAQs on the MEP State director

a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.*
b. *Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	68	41.89	52	66.70
Counselors	0	0.00	1	0.00
All paraprofessionals	42	25.92	46	38.67
Recruiters	63	56.24	29	23.38
Records transfer staff	5	3.20	3	3.00
Comments: This information was verified as coming directly from the school districts and Migrant Regional Offices. Several districts had an increase in enrollment and had to staff accordingly. The summer camps saw an increase in numbers in the 0809 school year and additional staff was needed to accomodate the increase. The State Director also awarded summer grants to those districts with innovative summer camps. This was an additional factor that led to an increase in staffing.				

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
   1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
   2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*

c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*

d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*

e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*

f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	42	25.90	46	38.70
Comments: This information has been verified as it is reported to the state office from the regional project coordinators. The KYMEP experienced some increase in student participation that allows for more staff as well as a focus on student services. LEAs were encouraged to focus on student services, especially quality instruction to students.				

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
   1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
   2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do <u>not</u> include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
    - **Adult Corrections: An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.**
    - **At-Risk Programs: Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.**
    - **Juvenile Corrections: An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.**
    - **Juvenile Detention Facilities: Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.**
    - **Multiple Purpose Facility: An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.**
    - **Neglected Programs: An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.**
    - **Other: Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve** <u>non-adjudicated children</u> **and youth.**

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	37	83
Adult corrections	10	45
Other	0	0
Total	47	82

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:
How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	37
Adult Corrections	10
Other	0
Total	47
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			2,821	98	
Long Term Students Served			1,864	63	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander			N<10	N<10	
Black, non-Hispanic			745	56	
Hispanic			73	N<10	
White, non-Hispanic			1,987	38	
Total			2,821	98	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			2,325	96	
Female			496	N<10	
Total			2,821	98	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			N<10	N<10	
6			N<10	N<10	
7			N<10	N<10	
8			N<10	N<10	
9			N<10	N<10	
10			N<10	N<10	
11			N<10	N<10	
12			56	N<10	
13			173	N<10	
14			319	N<10	

15			508	N<10	
16			687	N<10	
17			742	N<10	
18			294	N<10	
19			32	30	
20			N<10	62	
21			N<10	N<10	
Total			2,821	98	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box

below. This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: All blanks should be 0.
FAQ on Unduplicated Count:
What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should <u>not</u> exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	37	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	32	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	27	1	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		2,156		
Enrolled in a GED program		309	96	
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		1,385		
Earned a GED		175	31	
Obtained high school diploma		115		
Were accepted into post-secondary education		76		
Enrolled in post-secondary education		60		
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		620	N<10	
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education		74		
Obtained employment		193	N<10	
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of <u>long-term</u> students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading.Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities <u>together</u> in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		1,536	40	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		1,135	42	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams		176	N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		114	N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		156	N<10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		160	N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		529	23	
Comments: All blanks should be 0.				

FAQ on long-term students:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		1,649	41	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		1,198	44	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams		170	N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		94	N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		191	10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		190	N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		553	24	
Comments: All blanks should be 0.				

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	4	63
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	15	32
Juvenile corrections	13	71
Other	0	0
Total	32	22

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on average length of stay:
How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent

students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	4
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	15
Juvenile corrections	13
Other	0
Total	32
Comments:	

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

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the underlined number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	788		6,263	1,246	
Total Long Term Students Served	98		639	350	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10		14	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	N<10		20	N<10	
Black, non-Hispanic	123		1,941	162	
Hispanic	14		171	17	
White, non-Hispanic	647		4,117	1,060	
Total	788		6,263	1,246	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	386		4,337	913	
Female	402		1,926	333	
Total	788		6,263	1,246	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
6	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
7	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
8	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
9	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
10	N<10		20	N<10	
11	N<10		29	N<10	
12	N<10		110	27	
13	75		363	88	
14	95		703	149	
15	159		1,099	276	
16	156		1,504	311	
17	177		1,630	352	

18	85		720	30	
19	22		81	N<10	
20	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
21					
Total	788		6,263	1,246	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: All blanks should be 0.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count: FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (<u>not students</u>) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should <u>not</u> exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	4	0	26	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	4	0	17	0
Awarded GED(s)	1	0	12	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	383		2,305	
Enrolled in a GED program	N<10		142	
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	537		5,241	
Earned a GED	N<10		89	
Obtained high school diploma	64		98	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	N<10		55	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	N<10		43	
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	33		1,226	
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	N<10		33	
Obtained employment	45		83	
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the underlined number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	63		650	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	67		478	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	26		82	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	17		41	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10		78	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10		81	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	14		196	
Comments: All blanks should be 0.				

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	91		658	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	86		469	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	20		88	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	20		38	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10		80	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	20		76	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	23		187	
Comments: All blanks should be 0.				

2.7 *SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)*

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Safe schools or behavior data is collected and reported annually by the school and district. We receive reports of all law and board violations that result in out-of-school suspension, expulsion with/without services, and corporal punishment (where applicable). We did not collect alternative placement data in 2008-09.	Safe school or behavior data is reported at the school level in the student information system used in all school districts. This data is compiled at the district level and submitted by June 30th of each school year to the Kentucky Department of Education. It is then sent to the Kentucky Center for School Safety at Eastern Kentucky University for analysis and publication as the Kentucky Annual Safe School Data Report.	annually	2008-2009	2006-07: 2007-08: 2008-09:	2006-07:	KY has no specific targets, other than to decrease the total number of discipline incidents each year.	1993
Comments: KY has no specific targets, other than to decrease the total number of discipline incidents each year.							

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

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	This refers to possession and use, and/or distribution of a liquor, brew, or mixture containing alcohol. Also, driving under the influence of alcohol with blood alcohol levels of .08 for those above age 21, and .02 for those below 21 years old.
Illicit drug related	Refers to the illegal possession and use, and/or distribution of the following drugs: marijuana/hashish, hallucinogenics, amphetamines, barbiturates, heroin, cocaine/crack, prescription drugs, inhalants, and other drugs not listed.
Violent incident without physical injury	Refers to fighting, with three categories of minor physical aggression: Fighting -student to student; fighting -student to staff; fighting -student to other (non-students or non-school staff).
Violent incident with physical injury	Refers to assault with two categories: Assault in the 1st degree -causes serious physical injury to another person by means of a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument; or manifests extreme indifference to the value of human life by wantonly engaging in conduct which creates a grave risk of death or causes serious physical injury to another person. Assault in the 2nd degree -intentionally causes serious physical injury to another person; or intentionally causes physical injury to another person by means of a deadly weapon or a dangerous instrument; or wantonly causes serious injury to another person by means of a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument.
Weapons possession	Refers to possession of a handgun, a rifle, other firearm, or other weapon (knife, etc.).
Comments:	

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

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2,032	174
6 through 8	6,871	174
9 through 12	6,969	174
Comments: Numbers verified as correct 4/19/10.		

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

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	N<10	174
9 through 12	N<10	174
Comments: Numbers verified as correct 4/19/10.		

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

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	N<10	174
9 through 12	67	174
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	N<10	174
9 through 12	N<10	174
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	31	174
6 through 8	64	174
9 through 12	122	174
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	N<10	174
9 through 12	14	174
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	71	174
9 through 12	261	174
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	N<10	174
9 through 12	N<10	174
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	346	174
9 through 12	1,236	174
Comments: Numbers verified as correct 4/19/10.		

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

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	174
6 through 8	26	174
9 through 12	113	174
Comments: Numbers verified as correct 4/19/10.		

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five <u>most common</u> efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
No	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No Response	Other Specify 1
No Response	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of ESEA, as amended, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4MB.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	40	0.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	0	
Comments: Only 40 of the 174 school districts who received Title V funds in 2007-08 had carry forward funds. Therefore, only 40 completed needs assessments specific to the Title V funds for 2008-09 school year. No new funds were allocated or transferred into Title V.		

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

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	90,493	99.1
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	91,352	
Comments: The total carry forward funds for the 40 school districts for the 2008-09 school year was $91,352.00. No new funds were allocated or transferred into Title V. Of the carry forward funds, 99.1% of the funds were used for the 4 strategic priorities.		

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

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	40	13
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	40	13
Comments: Of the 40 districts that had carry forward funds, 13 of those districts made AYP.		

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

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
Comments:	

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

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	6
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	33
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	24
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	8
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	34
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	5
Comments:	

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's goals and objectives were for districts to utilize the funds to increase student academic achievement and decrease the dropout rate. Kentucky's dropout rate has decreased over the last few years and student achievement has also increased. However, it is hard to compare the student achievement data from the last two years as our state assessment has changed. The achievement gaps have not totally closed but the gaps are narrowing and achievement in most populations has increased at the state level.

Most districts focused their RLIS funds in the area of professional development for teachers with an emphasis in the content areas and with the populations that caused the schools and districts to not make adequate yearly progress. This included paying for substitutes for teacher release time, consultant fees, and travel and salaries for curriculum coaches for on-site, job-embedded professional development. The other heavy focus was on assessment software to collect summative data on students, such as ThinkLink, Compass Learning, Study Island and MAPS. This also included the purchase of computers and mobile computer labs to run the assessment software.

Funds were also used to prevent student dropouts in the form of additional staff at the alternative schools to offer a wider range of content areas for graduation credit and the employment of School Resource Officers for safer schools.

Specific examples of how some districts used the RLIS funds are as follows:

Caldwell County used the funds for a School Resource Officer at the high school and for two staff members at the alternative school.

Danville Independent purchased ThinkLink and teachers participated in the Rick Stiggins training on Assessment for Learning.

McLean County purchased Compass Learning, computers and mobile computer labs of mini notebooks.

Bell County used funds to pay for substitutes and/or stipends for teachers to meet as a Professional Learning Community to analyze student work, implement Response to Intervention, and participate in conferences with parents.

Knott County provided professional development for the teacher cadres and provided substitute pay as well as materials for the professional development.

Pike County employed professional development staff for job-embedded professional development with a focus on incorporating technolgy into the daily lessons. The focus was to use technolgy to supplement and enhance the content lessons.

Carter County focused funds on parent involvement activities, instructional services to students for tutoring and Response to Intervention activities, professional development for teachers, development of a District Informational Booklet to showcase each school's academic programs and highlights for the 2008-09 school year given to each student and placed in local businesses.

These are only a few examples from a random sample of districts outlining how the districts used RLIS funds to increase student achievement and to prevent student dropouts.

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

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2008-09?	No
Comments:	

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	9
Comments:	

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	4	2
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	1	4
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	8	2
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		5
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	261,560.00	6,602.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	1,133.00	15,200.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	27,467.00	23,693.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		244,665.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		
Total	290,160.00	290,160.00
Comments:		

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

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority

through evaluation studies.