

**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 2009-10

KENTUCKY



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

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) 2009-10 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~~4~~, 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 200~~5~~6, 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 ED Facts 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
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		
		Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 1:50:45 PM
Signature _____		

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Senate Bill 1, passed by the 2009 Kentucky General Assembly and codified as KRS 158.6451, required higher, clearer and more in-depth academic standards for Kentucky public schools. In a joint meeting during February 2010, the chairs of the Kentucky Board of Education, the Council on Postsecondary Education and the Education Professional Standards Board signed a resolution directing their respective agencies to implement the Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and mathematics, formalizing Kentucky's agreement to integrate the standards into the state's public education system. With this action, Kentucky became the first state to formally accept the standards.

In June 2010, the Kentucky Board of Education gave final approval to 704 KAR 3:303, the regulation related to the Kentucky core academic standards. While new standards were adopted for English/language arts and mathematics, Kentucky's previously approved science standards remain in place until new common core science standards are developed.

To help teachers successfully implement the new standards, state agencies and partner groups are providing support and training throughout the 2010-11 school year. Teachers will begin to provide instruction related to the standards in the fall of 2011 and students will be assessed on the Common Core Standards beginning in the spring of 2012.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to the assessments and/or academic achievement standards are planned for the 2010-11 school year. In spring 2011, Kentucky will field test items in English/language arts and mathematics to complete the item pool necessary to create a new assessment in spring 2012 that will be designed to measure the new Kentucky core academic standards.
--

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	94.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	6.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	345,052		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	480		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,212		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	36,411		>97
Hispanic	10,221		>97
White, non-Hispanic	286,131		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	45,623		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,466		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	191,123		>97
Migratory students	1,225		>97
Male	177,376		>97
Female	167,671		>97

Comments: In Kentucky there are 2 reasons that the number of students attempting the test and assignment of performance levels could be different. First, students that are identified as first year LEP must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level. Second, students that are not exempt from the test but don't attempt the test are not assigned a performance level (Examples: refusal to take the test or parents keeping the child at home during the testing window).

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,699	27.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,159	64.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,723	8.2
Total	45,581	

Comments: In Kentucky there are 2 reasons that the number of students attempting the test and assignment of performance levels could be different. First, students that are identified as first year LEP must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level. Second, students that are not exempt from the test but don't attempt the test are not assigned a performance level (Examples: refusal to take the test or parents keeping the child at home during the testing window).

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	348,578		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	489		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,273		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	36,884		>97
Hispanic	10,427		>97
White, non-Hispanic	288,762		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	46,473		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,595		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	194,691		>97
Migratory students	1,235		>97
Male	179,498		>97
Female	169,074		>97

Comments: In Kentucky there are 2 reasons that the number of students attempting the test and assignment of performance levels could be different. First, students that are identified as first year LEP must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level. Second, students that are not exempt from the test but don't attempt the test are not assigned a performance level (Examples: refusal to take the test or parents keeping the child at home during the testing window).

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,989	28.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,696	64.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,749	8.1
Total	46,434	

Comments: In Kentucky there are 2 reasons that the number of students attempting the test and assignment of performance levels could be different. First, students that are identified as first year LEP must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level. Second, students that are not exempt from the test but don't attempt the test are not assigned a performance level (Examples: refusal to take the test or parents keeping the child at home during the testing window).

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	144,931		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	207		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,721		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	15,381		>97
Hispanic	3,971		>97
White, non-Hispanic	120,732		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18,138		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,434		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	77,426		>97
Migratory students	498		>97
Male	74,491		>97
Female	70,438		>97

Comments: In Kentucky there are 2 reasons that the number of students attempting the test and assignment of performance levels could be different. First, students that are identified as first year LEP must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level. Second, students that are not exempt from the test but don't attempt the test are not assigned a performance level(Examples: refusal to take the test or parents keeping the child at home during the testing window).

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,528	63.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,021	27.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,564	8.6
Total	18,113	

Comments: In Kentucky there are 2 reasons that the number of students attempting the test and assignment of performance levels could be different. First, students that are identified as first year LEP must attempt the test but are not assigned a performance level. Second, students that are not exempt from the test but don't attempt the test are not assigned a performance level(Examples: refusal to take the test or parents keeping the child at home during the testing window).

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,227	39,089	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	35	59.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	695	596	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,420	3,064	56.5
Hispanic	1,880	1,308	69.6
White, non-Hispanic	41,746	33,077	79.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,272	4,528	54.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,477	921	62.4
Economically disadvantaged students	30,121	20,870	69.3
Migratory students	182	124	68.1
Male	26,337	19,933	75.7
Female	24,889	19,156	77.0
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	51,227	39,313	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	33	55.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	695	565	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,420	3,187	58.8
Hispanic	1,880	1,292	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	41,746	33,203	79.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,272	4,906	59.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,477	848	57.4
Economically disadvantaged students	30,121	20,958	69.6
Migratory students	182	121	66.5
Male	26,337	19,535	74.2
Female	24,889	19,778	79.5
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers science at grades 4, 7, and 11. Therefore, science data is not available at grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,759	38,011	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	81	57	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	661	564	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,488	2,920	53.2
Hispanic	1,662	1,123	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	41,577	32,424	78.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,546	4,044	53.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,179	670	56.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29,501	19,794	67.1
Migratory students	148	86	58.1
Male	26,186	19,523	74.6
Female	24,573	18,488	75.2
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,759	40,275	79.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	81	60	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	661	562	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,488	3,417	62.3
Hispanic	1,662	1,246	75.0
White, non-Hispanic	41,577	33,994	81.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,546	4,702	62.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,179	745	63.2
Economically disadvantaged students	29,501	21,504	72.9
Migratory students	148	103	69.6
Male	26,186	19,758	75.5
Female	24,573	20,517	83.5
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50,759	35,744	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	81	58	71.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	661	494	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,488	2,456	44.8
Hispanic	1,662	992	59.7
White, non-Hispanic	41,577	30,912	74.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,546	3,914	51.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,179	536	45.5
Economically disadvantaged students	29,501	18,198	61.7
Migratory students	148	75	50.7
Male	26,186	18,601	71.0
Female	24,573	17,143	69.8
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,866	33,695	67.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	39	60.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	596	497	83.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,245	2,435	46.4
Hispanic	1,495	895	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	41,255	29,071	70.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,896	3,003	43.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	877	386	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	28,526	16,617	58.3
Migratory students	178	97	54.5
Male	25,606	17,091	66.7
Female	24,258	16,604	68.4
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,866	37,080	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	47	73.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	596	482	80.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,245	3,052	58.2
Hispanic	1,495	1,023	68.4
White, non-Hispanic	41,255	31,609	76.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,896	3,606	52.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	877	445	50.7
Economically disadvantaged students	28,526	19,029	66.7
Migratory students	178	111	62.4
Male	25,606	17,765	69.4
Female	24,258	19,315	79.6
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers science at grades 4, 7, and 11. Therefore, science data is not available at grade 5.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,732	33,738	67.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	55	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	531	418	78.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,207	2,198	42.2
Hispanic	1,508	886	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	41,297	29,506	71.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,365	2,710	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	751	274	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,073	16,374	58.3
Migratory students	178	107	60.1
Male	25,358	16,557	65.3
Female	24,374	17,181	70.5
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49,732	34,819	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	53	71.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	531	411	77.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,207	2,622	50.4
Hispanic	1,508	925	61.3
White, non-Hispanic	41,297	30,097	72.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,365	2,653	41.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	751	257	34.2
Economically disadvantaged students	28,073	17,064	60.8
Migratory students	178	100	56.2
Male	25,358	16,286	64.2
Female	24,374	18,533	76.0
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers science at grades 4, 7, and 11. Therefore, science data is not available at grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,690	30,984	63.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	38	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	531	425	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,099	1,968	38.6
Hispanic	1,325	720	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	40,637	27,259	67.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,010	2,305	38.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	665	224	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	26,846	14,153	52.7
Migratory students	214	115	53.7
Male	25,181	15,517	61.6
Female	23,507	15,466	65.8
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,690	33,702	69.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	40	56.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	531	420	79.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,099	2,502	49.1
Hispanic	1,325	816	61.6
White, non-Hispanic	40,637	29,243	72.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,010	2,351	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	665	238	35.8
Economically disadvantaged students	26,846	15,953	59.4
Migratory students	214	116	54.2
Male	25,181	15,882	63.1
Female	23,507	17,819	75.8
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a	#Students Scoring at or Above	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,690	27,766	57.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	31	43.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	531	366	68.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,099	1,323	25.9
Hispanic	1,325	578	43.6
White, non-Hispanic	40,637	25,003	61.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,010	1,923	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	665	143	21.5
Economically disadvantaged students	26,846	12,143	45.2
Migratory students	214	100	46.7
Male	25,181	14,923	59.3
Female	23,507	12,842	54.6
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,944	27,221	55.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	37	49.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	504	371	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,130	1,605	31.3
Hispanic	1,264	596	47.2
White, non-Hispanic	41,076	24,165	58.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,952	1,799	30.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	574	149	26.0
Economically disadvantaged students	26,718	11,767	44.0
Migratory students	183	85	46.4
Male	25,391	13,990	55.1
Female	23,553	13,231	56.2
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,944	34,951	71.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	49	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	504	407	80.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,130	2,734	53.3
Hispanic	1,264	837	66.2
White, non-Hispanic	41,076	30,302	73.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,952	2,340	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	574	223	38.9
Economically disadvantaged students	26,718	16,591	62.1
Migratory students	183	117	63.9
Male	25,391	16,410	64.6
Female	23,553	18,541	78.7
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Kentucky administers science at grades 4, 7, and 11. Therefore, science data is not available at grade 8.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,284	18,241	40.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	55	14	25.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	456	311	68.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,779	1,009	21.1
Hispanic	918	288	31.4
White, non-Hispanic	38,499	16,419	42.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,580	743	16.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	392	56	14.3
Economically disadvantaged students	20,937	5,999	28.7
Migratory students	129	40	31.0
Male	23,024	9,016	39.2
Female	22,260	9,225	41.4
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,770	29,910	61.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	36	56.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	501	352	70.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,252	2,304	43.9
Hispanic	1,097	531	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	41,129	26,261	63.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,431	1,336	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	480	76	15.8
Economically disadvantaged students	24,458	12,144	49.7
Migratory students	138	57	41.3
Male	25,119	13,674	54.4
Female	23,650	16,236	68.7
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,284	18,630	41.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	55	24	43.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	456	258	56.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,779	857	17.9
Hispanic	918	266	29.0
White, non-Hispanic	38,499	17,036	44.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,580	723	15.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	392	25	6.4
Economically disadvantaged students	20,937	6,150	29.4
Migratory students	129	45	34.9
Male	23,024	10,000	43.4
Female	22,260	8,630	38.8
Comments: All data was verified and finalized as of November 8, 2010.			

1.4 SCHOOL DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,160	652	56.2
Districts	174	62	35.6
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	840	541	64.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	796	503	63.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	44	38	86.4
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
174	62	35.6
Comments: The number of districts that received Title I funds in SY2009-10 was corrected to now be 174.		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	17
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	13
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	6
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	19
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- An HSE worked daily with the staff during common planning time on improvement of instructional practices, deconstruction of the standards, and the development of common assessments in departments. An outside consultant worked with the leadership at the school on effective instructional practices, what those looked like, and coaching teachers in the development of effective instructional practices in their classrooms. These consultants worked with the leadership on analyzing school-wide data and working with teachers to use that data to inform instruction in the regular classroom and through Response to Intervention (RTI).
- The district and school leadership team (including department chairs) conducted monthly walkthroughs with discussions held immediately afterward; action plans were developed for each department for the following month. Progress on action plans were reviewed each month.
- The ASSIST Team was developed and utilized in advising the leadership in areas of academics/instruction, professional growth, professional development, planning, and school-based decision making council by-laws/policies and resources. The resources used in decision making were based on walkthrough observations, teacher and administrative conferences and rounds observations. An ASSIST Team lead served as a direct link to the superintendent. A gap coach worked with the school faculty to develop increased rigor and expectations. Immediate feedback was given to the principal and teachers.
- Involvement of the Highly Skilled Educator (HSE) for the 2010-2011 school year occurred at each school as well as involvement of a District ASSIST Team headed by Kentucky Department of Education personnel.
- Each school worked with a Highly Skilled Educator and contracted with the International Center for Leadership in Education for a consultant.
- A modified block schedule was utilized.
- Reading and math all year were scheduled for 75 minutes.
- A principal mentor was used.
- A school-based decision making mentor was accessed.
- Professional learning communities and the Kentucky Center for Instructional Discipline were used.
- A math coach was accessed.
- Special Education interventions occurred.
- Schools were assigned a priority manager and school-based decision making (SBDM) mentor. The priority manager provided job performance feedback about the principal to the superintendent and assistant superintendents for action. The SBDM mentor provided training, attended meetings for coaching/feedback, and assisted the school with improving SBDM efficiency. In addition, schools have implemented new research-based curriculums (i.e., CPM, CMP2).

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the proficiency target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the school year 2009-10, there were 11 school districts in year 1 and 2 of improvement and 62 school districts in corrective action. Districts that were in improvement status were required to revise their district improvement plan and post the plan on the district's website. The districts also were required to reserve 10% of the district allocation for professional development to be used with all schools in the district. Districts in corrective action were additionally required to submit a corrective action improvement plan to the SEA, post the plan on the district's website and were required to defer a percentage of the district's allocation to be used to hire ASSIST team members to work with the superintendent, district level school board and central office staff. Members of the ASSIST team included superintendent mentors, school board mentors, highly skilled educators, targeted intervention coaches, district achievement gap coordinators and state department program personnel. The ASSIST teams reviewed and analyzed student achievement data, reviewed district-wide curriculum, worked with principals in schools, helped implement intervention and improvement plans and conducted needs assessments for the district. In some districts scholastic reviews were conducted to help identify areas of need based on specific indicators in areas such as curriculum, instruction, policies, formative assessments, community and parental involvement and leadership. The state provided funding for the highly skilled educators, the program coordinators from the state department of education and the district achievement gap coordinators. The districts provided funding for the per diem and contracts for the superintendent mentors and school board mentors and the expenses to carry out strategies and activities recommended by the ASSIST teams. Monthly reports were written and submitted to the SEA for analysis to check progress toward goals, needed professional development and any unmet needs. The district superintendent, Title I coordinator and instructional supervisors were also part of a cadre that met bi-monthly with the SEA's division of school and district improvement to participate in professional development and data analysis.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	30
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	6
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	14
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	5
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	2
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	
---	--

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	41,643	41,936
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	21,975	20,799
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	52.8	49.6
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	42,270	42,775
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	26,638	24,965
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	63.0	58.4
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	32

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10

7

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

Comments:

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies) identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		106	4	24	A	
2		103	4	23	B	
3		88	3	20	C	
4		91	3	20	D	Reduced the number of office referrals for behavior problems; fewer suspensions occurred. This happened after all staff was trained in the KYCID's program. Increased student engagement due to increased use of technology for instruction. Significant increase in reading and math in the subpopulation of students with disabilities due to additional services provided to the students through support staff hired through improvement funds.
5		117	4	23		

Comments:

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

comprise this
combination.

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

Column 6 Response Options

Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C =Improved parental involvement

D =Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state department of education provided technical assistance meetings through webinars, direct phone calls, conference calls and face-to-face meetings. These were used to share effective strategies that were being implemented in other schools and districts and included research-based strategies that are proven effective in other schools. Teams from the schools and districts were brought to one central location for bi-monthly cadre meetings that included training and technical assistance. The technical assistance consisted of LEAs and schools sharing successful strategies, providing training from outside consultants, providing lists of resources (print, technology and personnel), analyzing student performance data, and training on how to identify effective strategies that can be replicated in their schools. Strategies and ideas were also shared during on-site monitoring of the programs.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0%

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Evaluation of the 1003g program and funds was an on-going process based on monthly progress reports prepared by the ASSIST teams assigned to the districts. The ASSIST teams consisted of district achievement gap coordinators provided by the SEA, highly skilled educators provided by the SEA, SEA program staff, district central office staff, targeted assistance coaches funded by the LEA and principals from schools receiving funds. Information from the monthly progress reports was used to determine the technical assistance that was provided in bi-monthly cadre meetings that were held face-to-face at one central location. The costs for the statewide bi-monthly cadre meetings were funded with the SEA administrative funds from 1003a and 1003g. The monthly reports prepared by highly skilled educators provided information on professional development needs, analysis of student assessment data and progress toward reaching benchmarks and goals. These reports were used to determine the specific professional development offered at the cadre meetings, if on-site monitoring was needed, or if outside trainers were needed. The monthly reports were reviewed by the SEA program staff with the division of federal programs as well as with the division of school improvement and leadership development. On-site monitoring by SEA program staff was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement program, the effectiveness of the ASSIST teams and to determine additional needs of the school and district to ensure student progress toward proficiency.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools in corrective action and restructuring are provided ASSIST team members. Some of the members are highly skilled educators (HSEs) and some are SEA program staff. The majority of the HSEs are funded with state funds and the SEA program staffs are funded with state or other federal funds. The ASSIST teams had monthly meetings but the HSEs spent 90% of their time in the schools and/or districts. The school leadership team also attended bi-monthly statewide cadre meetings for schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring. The statewide cadre meetings were 80% funded by state funds.

The schools in corrective action and restructuring also received scholastic audits. Audits had teams made up of specific job positions (superintendents, principals, parents, community members, HSEs, District Achievement Gap Coordinators, etc.) who reviewed data, conducted interviews, observed classrooms, and reviewed school policies. These audits were paid for with a combination of state and federal funds. Schools in restructuring or corrective action received leadership audits to determine the effectiveness of the school leadership. Results of the leadership audit were used to determine if the principal should be replaced, a principal mentor hired or a school administrative manager (SAM) hired. The leadership audits were funded by state level improvement funds. The salary of the SAM or the principal mentor would come from the SEA required deferred Title I, Part A funds.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	52,956
Applied to transfer	791
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	553
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 345,705

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	21

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	33,367
Applied for supplemental educational services	4,869
Received supplemental educational services	3,550
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 5,374,848
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	167,121	164,212	98.3	2,909	1.7
All elementary classes	76,128	75,489	99.2	639	0.8
All secondary classes	90,993	88,723	97.5	2,270	2.5

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
---	------------------------------

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state allows a district to opt for either method of reporting at the district's discretion.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	1.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	74.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	50.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	35.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	14,810	14,673	99.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	18,618	18,555	99.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	12,524	12,108	96.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	24,788	24,463	98.7

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	73.0	49.0
Poverty metric used	percentage of free/reduced lunch students.	
Secondary schools	71.0	44.0
Poverty metric used	percentage of free/reduced lunch students.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Some districts offer Newcomer Centers for middle and high school students.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	15,895
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	22,410
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	8,905
Uncoded languages	2,027
Japanese	440
Arabic	430
Chinese	405

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	15,731
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	153
Total	15,884
Comments: The total number of students tested and not tested is less than the total number in the state because of the mobility of this population and the fact that the data is pulled from two different times in the school year.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,129
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13.5
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	14,769
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	147
Total	14,916
<p>Comments: The number of Title III served LEP students assessed on state annual ELP assessments (14,769) is less than 95% or greater than 105% of the total number of Title III students (22,410) reported in 1.6.2.2 because of the mobility of this population and the fact that the data is pulled from two different times in the school year. As far as the reasons for the number of students not tested, some were not tested because they had a medical reason indicating that the students could not test and others were identified as Alternate Assessment students and that test for LEP students has not yet been implemented.</p>	
<p>In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).</p>	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	4,282

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	4,385	41.8	5,423	51.00
Attained proficiency	2,021	13.7	566	3.80
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
0
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,080	753	2,833
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,541	1,884	74.1	657
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,565	2,128	83.0	437
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,036	610	58.9	426
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	39
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	25
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	38
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	26
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	3
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Each consortium is counted as one subgrantee.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u> </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
5,943	200	11

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	167
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	39	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	30	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	28	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	14	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	18	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	21	2,250
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	26	830
PD provided to principals	15	193
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	25	174
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	12	580
PD provided to community based organization personnel	6	95
Total	0	4,122

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
8/11/10	9/16/10	35
Comments:		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky implemented a new method and timeline for collecting LEP and immigrant data in 2009-2010 that will result in shortening the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. As a result, Kentucky LEAs will receive final award notification 6-8 weeks sooner than in previous grant years.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	

Comments: Kentucky had 0 Persistently Dangerous schools in 2009-10.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Graduation rate data is not available for all student groups since the student level data collection system has not been fully implemented. See explanation in the next box below for when the system will be fully implemented.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

a. Kentucky's graduation rate as reported in 1.8.1 is the NCES Leaver rate for 2008-09, which was used for 2010 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations.
b. Kentucky requested and received an extension from USED concerning the 2011 deadline for reporting the cohort graduation rate. Kentucky will track first-time 9th graders beginning with the 2009-10 cohort until they graduate four years later in 2013. Kentucky will report the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR) as the transitional graduation rate from 2010 through 2012. Kentucky will collect 2013 graduate data in the fall of 2013 and report the 2013 four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate beginning in the fall of 2013.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	<3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.4
Hispanic	<3
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	<3
Female	<3
<p>Comments: Data is not available for all student groups since the student level data collection system has not been fully implemented. Kentucky requested and received an extension from USED concerning the 2011 deadline for reporting the cohort graduation rate. Kentucky will track first-time 9th graders beginning with the 2009-10 cohort until they graduate four years later in 2013. At that time the dropout rates will be reported for all groups.</p>	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	76	76
LEAs with subgrants	98	98
Total	174	174
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	15	796
K	513	1,675
1	216	1,807
2	126	1,798
3	150	1,813
4	411	1,716
5	276	1,585
6	131	1,465
7	114	1,420
8	97	1,423
9	112	1,606
10	118	1,376
11	119	1,063
12	22	1,084
Ungraded	19	38
Total	2,439	20,665
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	322	2,874
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,903	16,103
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	58	1,160
Hotels/Motels	156	528
Total	2,439	20,665
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	841
K	1,670
1	1,811
2	1,801
3	1,817
4	1,725
5	1,589
6	1,484
7	1,414
8	1,434
9	1,606
10	1,382
11	1,061
12	1,088
Ungraded	38
Total	20,761
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	707
Migratory children/youth	253
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,147
Limited English proficient students	723
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	28
Expedited evaluations	19
Staff professional development and awareness	19
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	28
Transportation	19
Early childhood programs	19
Assistance with participation in school programs	26
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	21
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	19
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	21
Counseling	19
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	19
Clothing to meet a school requirement	31
School supplies	37
Referral to other programs and services	26
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	21
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	19
School Selection	19
Transportation	19
School records	19
Immunizations	23
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Getting student records from other states as students come from surrounding states has been an issue that requires repeated calls and several contacts to assist students and their families. Jefferson County Public Schools receives many students who come to Louisville, KY from seven other states surrounding Kentucky. We have to make an initial call and request information. Then, we have to wait for the responses we need. Students are enrolled immediately; then, we have to adjust their placements based on the records we receive.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	853	488
4	841	536
5	793	439
6	749	351
7	762	376
8	719	360
High School	703	312
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	853	472
4	841	426
5	793	357
6	749	304
7	762	295
8	719	196
High School	565	118
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	629
K	219
1	226
2	188
3	192
4	159
5	143
6	119
7	137
8	122
9	89
10	82
11	59
12	26
Ungraded	54
Out-of-school	1,317
Total	3,761
Comments: This data has been verified by the migrant database, MIS2000.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 numbers for Kentucky increased by about 21.5%. The KYMEP believes this is due to a variety of factors. First, there has been a major focus on Identification and Recruitment. The state ID&R Coordinator has held more trainings on a variety of topics for more staff. There have been region-specific trainings done at regional meetings, district specific trainings done at the LEAs, one-on-one trainings when new staff is hired, and the annual recruiter training. The ID&R Coordinator has made the regulations well-known and trained everyone, allowing for staff to better recruit. All of the recruiters are well-trained and dedicated. The ID&R Coordinator has also recruited more with district and regional staff to encourage an ID&R focus. The State Director has added to the district assurances that a district must have a recruiter to have a program, and if necessary, the recruiter should be proficient in Spanish. There were recruiting blitzes done in two regions that allowed for more leads and contacts to be made, and this resulted in recruiting more students. Kentucky is experiencing an increase in OSYs and PreK kids, which reflects the nationwide trend. Last, all regional offices now employ at least one regional recruiter who recruits in districts without stand-alone programs but may still have migrant students. The regional recruiters also assist the LEAs in recruiting when needed. Overall, the increased focus on ID&R of migrant children and families has led to an increase in our numbers.

Agriculturally, tobacco has been the main qualifying crop in Kentucky. There has been a decrease in farmers, but the existing farms have grown larger and need more workers, as tobacco is very labor intensive.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	196
K	106
1	115
2	112
3	89
4	79
5	75
6	65
7	52
8	63
9	45
10	36
11	28
12	19
Ungraded	15
Out-of-school	71
Total	1,166
Comments: This data has been verified with the migrant database, MIS2000.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's Category 2 numbers increased by approximately 14.5%. This is due to an increase in migrant students statewide, which was explained in the previous narrative. The KYMEP has also encouraged district and regional programs to offer summer school programming for students. Additionally, the KYMEP has offered additional funding for districts and regions that provide exceptional summer programming to encourage a continuation of programs. The KYMEP offered additional monies for programs that did not have enough money in their budget to offer summer programming for their students. This allowed programs to provide summer camps for students who otherwise would not have had an opportunity. All of these factors contributed to the increase in the Category 2 child count.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The system Kentucky used to compile its Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period is MIS2000. The Category 1 and Category 2 child count for the last reporting period was also compiled using MIS2000.
--

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data collected includes all student information: name, sex, birth date, age, grade, multiple birth indicator, ethnicity, birthplace, parents'/guardians' names, current address, phone number, and student number and COE number (both randomly generated through MIS2000). The data collected for eligibility were: the QAD (month/day/year), qualifying worker, relationship to child, type of work (temporary or seasonal), residency date (month/day/year), withdrawal date (month/day/year) and termination date (month/day/year). These were entered and/or calculated by MIS2000 with the qualifying activity and comments provided, if needed. School information data collected were: enrollment date (month/day/year), withdrawal date (month/day/year), enrollment type (S for summer school, I for intersession, null for regular school) and attendance data provided for all children enrolled in school (summer intersession and regular). Additional data collected were on supplemental programs. The supplemental programs were broken down into two categories. The first was Supplemental Instruction: Reading Instruction, Math Instruction, and Other Instruction (the other content areas). The second category was Supportive Services: Support Service and Referrals. The Priority for Services were broken down into two categories. The first was level 1- most in need of immediate services (enrolled in 2 or more schools during the regular school year, enrolled late in school or withdrew early from school plus at least one of the following: has a current IEP or 504 plan, received a score less than 5 on the WIDA/WAPT Access test, received a D or F in core content classes, scored novice on the state assessment, has been retained or is over age, is not on grade level for reading or math, or has missed 10+ days in the current school year due to the migratory lifestyle). The second category was level 2 - can include one or more of the following: has a current IEP or 504 plan, received a score less than 5 on the WIDA/WAPT Access test, received a D or F in core content classes, scored novice on the state assessment, has been retained or is over age, is not on grade level for reading or math, has missed 10+ days in the current school year due to the migratory lifestyle, has no access to preschool, speaks limited English (3-5 year olds), or qualifies for preschool based on disability.

The KYMEP has a needs assessment form with all of these factors listed and a check box. Within two weeks of signing up a new student, the recruiter will complete the form and submit it to the regional office clerk. The clerk then checks the appropriate boxes on the assessment screen and a score is calculated, which determines the level, if any, of PFS.

Recruiters use a Basic Interview Pattern (BIP) and Certificate of Eligibility (COE) to collect data on students to determine eligibility. The BIP predetermines eligibility before the COE is filled out and establishes a migrant history, if applicable. Kentucky began using a Kentucky-specific National COE at the start of the 2009-10 school year. All districts were using the new COE by August 18, 2009. Once these two forms are completed, reviewed by the recruiter, and signed and reviewed by someone else in the district office, they are sent to the regional office for further review. Once they are determined eligible at the regional level, the data are entered in MIS2000. Kentucky has 4 regional offices, each with a coordinator and clerk. Each regional clerk enters the data for the fiscal year continuously during the year. The data entered from the COE have been described above. A Kentucky Migrant Student Withdrawal Form is used to withdraw each student. This is used when a student moves out of the school district and/or at the end of the school year. The information on the Withdrawal Form includes: district name, student's name, withdrawal date, attendance dates, supplemental programs and secondary credit information on students in grades 9-12. A timeline is provided to the clerks showing the deadline for this regular school information submission to be July 31. For students participating in the summer/intersession programs, their data are also entered into MIS2000 using a summer/intersession form. The information includes: student's name, school name, attendance dates, supplemental instruction and support services. This information is entered at the conclusion of the summer project. The timeline shows the deadline for entering this information as August 31.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information from the COE is entered into MIS2000 by the regional clerks. Once a student COE is determined to be eligible by the regional office, the information is entered. At the conclusion of each day, an upload process is run. This is also done with the MSIX database. Each night an upload is done into MSIX, updating it with any new Kentucky information.

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

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

In order to provide updated information for child count purposes, a timeline has been established for regional office clerks. During the months of August and September, enrollment information for the regular school year is due at the regional clerk's office two weeks after the beginning of school. Continued Residency Verification Signatures must be signed and due in the state office in September. Any time new information is discovered about a child, that information is immediately given to the regional clerk by the SEA or LEA to be updated in the state database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Students for Category 2 were identified by the MIS2000 system using a query to filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. The dates of 5/15/10- 08/01/10 were identified for summer schoollintersession. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicated enrollment in summer school or intersession. MIS2000 was filtered to pick up either "S" or "I", but not both for funding purposes.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky generated its reports using MIS2000, running queries that filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. Using the dates of 9/1/09 through 8/31/10, MIS2000 developed a report for Kentucky determining the number of students. The report looked at the QAD being within 36 months of the start date. The termination, withdrawal, residency, QAD and enrollment dates fall between the start and end dates in the report. MIS2000 calculated these students within the start date and end date for the school year.

Students for Category 2 were identified by the MIS2000 system using a query to filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. The dates of 5/15/10 through 8/01/10 were used for summer school/intersession. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicated enrollment in summer school or intersession. MIS2000 was filtered to pick up either "S" or "I", but not both for funding purposes.

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

The COEs used in Kentucky have an original COE with a color seal. This is the first year of doing this. The new national COE Kentucky began using 8/15/09 does not use triplicates as in the past. The original is removed and filed in the regional migrant office. The district migrant office keeps a copy of the original COE and BIP for their working files. If the family still resides within the district during the remaining two years of eligibility, a parent signature is obtained at the bottom of the COE one time during each funding year to forward to the state office. However, due to budget cuts across the state and district travel restrictions, the local MEP personnel could obtain a signature from someone who had physically seen each student listed on the COE. This person's signature would include a comment as to the location and the dates each child was last physically seen. After the signature is obtained, a copy of the COE is returned to the regional migrant office showing all the required signatures that indicate residence within the school district. This is updated in MIS2000 to show the student is still residing in the district for the next funding year. The student names from the COEs along with the parent signatures are matched with the unduplicated list of students used for the child count to validate residence within Kentucky.

In the case of Category 2, using a MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 5/15/10-8/01/10 as the start and end dates indicating a child has at least attended 1 day of summer school or intersession. The report asks that the QAD be within three years of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the end date; the 22nd birth date is greater than the end date; the termination, funding, withdrawal, residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates; the 22nd birth date is greater than the funding date; and the 3rd birthday is less than the withdrawal date. As a result, the report is designed to locate all children whose eligibility ended before the start dates of summer or intersession services and these are not included in Category 2. Summer school is indicated by "S" being placed in the enrollment type and intersession is indicated by "I" being placed in the enrollment type. These students are recipients of MEP-funded services.

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

Once a student is entered in the MIS2000 system, an on-going procedure is used to ensure that duplicate records are identified and eliminated. Each records clerk will run a "Potential Duplicate Students" report once a month. The Potential Duplicate Students report looks at matching date of birth, close dates of birth, date of birth plus last or first name match date of birth, first name potentially adopted duplicates, the same student number and a soundex match (first and/or last names that sound the same). If the clerk finds duplicate students, an e-mail is sent to the state consultant for records clerks. The clerk asks the state consultant to merge the two numbers due to finding duplicate student numbers/records for one student. The student number to be kept is identified and the number to be merged is identified. The state consultant runs the same report as mentioned above once a month. If the state consultant cannot determine which

student number to retain, the local migrant projects are consulted and the determination is made from there. Once a student with the originally assigned number is determined, the state consultant will merge the numbers. Kentucky is confident that unique identification numbers are assigned for each child. The MIS2000 child counts can determine this from selected factors, such as birthplace, parent names, birth place and student name, and the child will be counted one time for funding purposes. Both the regional records clerk and the state consultant run monthly reports to check for duplication.

MSIX also helps to determine potential duplicate students. The state consultant determines merges for migrant students in MSIX, and if necessary, updates of the MIS database are done as well to merge any duplicate students.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To ensure proper identification of eligibility, Kentucky begins with the standard COE used by all MEP projects. As of August 15, 2009, all MEP projects began to use the Kentucky-specific national COE. All MEP personnel were trained on the new COE during the summer 2009 via regional sessions. All eligibility determinations are made based upon a personal interview with the parent, guardian, or out-of-school youth. State personnel conduct annual training sessions for all recruiters. Training includes basic eligibility definitions, temporary versus seasonal processing, employment surveys, interviewing techniques (desirable vs. undesirable), timeline for crops, mock interviews and how to properly fill out the paperwork. All COEs are reviewed by the records clerk for missing or incomplete information and corrected prior to being given to the regional coordinator for review and signature. Copies of the COE are then sent to the state consultant in charge of recruitment and records where these are reviewed. Any questions regarding COEs are clarified by discussions with recruiters. If questions cannot be answered to the satisfaction of the state consultant, recruiters are asked to provide additional information or clarification, re-interview the family or the state consultant tells the family that they do not qualify. The state provides a handbook for recruitment (updated 9/1/10 to reflect the new NRG). Training has been provided to all recruiters either in state and regional sessions and/or on a one-on-one basis. SEA staff will randomly check eligibility decisions of recruiters during monitoring visits to local and regional projects through both reviews of original COEs and telephone or face-to-face contacts with families. SEA staff will also ride along with local and regional recruiters on recruiting visits to ensure quality recruiting practices. Regional MEP Coordinators also review random samples of eligibility decisions through telephone or face-to-face interviews with families.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The Kentucky Migrant Education Program re-interview procedures are as follows:

1. The regional clerk will run the random student sample report from MIS2000 to generate a random computerized list of students from that

region. Assistance will be given from the state MEP if necessary.

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

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

--Enter the date range 9/1/2007 - present (for 2010).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

--The findings from the reinterview forms are entered into a "reinterview" database created by the Office of Education Technology at the Kentucky Department of Education.

For the 09-10 funding year, approximately 208 reinterviews were done across the state. Of the 208 reinterviews, 18 were ineligible, or 8.6%; thus, 190 were eligible or 91.4%.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Individual Corrective Actions/Improvements:

The Kentucky MEP will continue to offer yearly recruiter trainings as well as one-on-one trainings to newly hired recruiters. The regional offices will offer professional development sessions at regional meetings. When possible, the ID&R coordinator will attend regional meetings and hold mini-trainings and provide guidance. The ID&R coordinator has shadowed several new recruiters. The state has also paired new recruiters to experienced recruiters for on-the-job training. In May, Kentucky held its second recruiting blitz in the Southeastern Region (Region D) that brought together 6 recruiters having varying experience levels to work with local districts/recruiters as well as districts without programs. Two more recruiting blitzes are planned using the same format.

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

Regional Corrective Actions/Improvements:

Corrective Action Plan for defect rates higher than 5% --

If the region has a defect rate higher than 5% from the re-interview process, then corrective actions will take place in that region. The purpose of these actions is to successfully lower the defect rate to (at most) 5% over a three-year period.

Year 1 defect rate: 6%-10%

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

Year 2 defect rate: 5%-9%

CORRECTIVE ACTION: Each recruiter will be required to attend trainings and professional development regardless of years of experience. One-on-one training with state ID&R coordinator and/or regional coordinator occurs. The recruitment plan will be directly monitored by the state ID&R coordinator.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At this time, Kentucky does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child count or the eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. With the support of four regional coordinators and clerks, the state feels the Quality Control supports the accuracy of this child count.