

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**

**KENTUCKY**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended in 2001</p>		
<p>Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12                      <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12</p>		
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:          Kentucky Department of Education</p>		
<p>Address:          500 Mero Street, First Floor, Capital Plaza Tower          Frankfort, Kentucky 40601</p>		
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>		
<p>Name: Mary Ann Miller</p>		
<p>Telephone: 502-564-3141</p>		
<p>Fax: 502-564-5680</p>		
<p>e-mail: MaryAnn.Miller@education.ky.gov</p>		
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):          Terry Holliday</p>		
		<p>Wednesday, March 6, 2013, 4:48:19 PM</p>
<p>Signature _____</p>		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
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**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2011-12	2011-12	2013-14

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 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 June 2010, the Kentucky Board of Education gave final approval to 704 KAR 3:303, the regulation related to Kentucky's Core Academic Standards. While the new Common Core State Standards were adopted for English/language arts and mathematics, Kentucky's previously approved state science standards remain in place until the new Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) are finalized and can be adopted. To help teachers successfully implement the new reading and mathematics standards, state agencies and partner groups provided support and training beginning in 2010-2011. Teachers began to provide instruction based on the new standards in fall 2011 and students were assessed on the new standards beginning in spring 2012.

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-12	2011-12	2014-15
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

<p>For regular assessments in grades 3-8, Kentucky administered the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP) for the first time in 2011-12. New academic achievement standards were set for reading and mathematics, while science was linked to previous content standards.</p> <p>For regular assessments in high school, Kentucky administered End-of-Course exams for the first time in 2011-12. New academic achievement standards were set for English II, Algebra II and Biology.</p> <p>For alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, Kentucky administered the Alternate Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (Alternate K-PREP) for the first time in 2011-12. New academic achievement standards were set for reading and mathematics, while science was linked to previous content standards.</p>
--

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

For regular assessments in grades 3-8, Kentucky administered the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP) for the first time in 2011-12 and set new standards for reading and mathematics. The science assessment was administered using the new K-PREP test design, but linked to previous standards.

For regular assessments in high school, Kentucky administered End-of-Course exams for the first time in 2011-12 and set standards for English II, Algebra II and Biology.

For alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, Kentucky administered the Alternate Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (Alternate K-PREP) for the first time in 2011-12 and set new standards for reading and mathematics. The science assessment was administered using the new Alternate K-PREP test design, but linked to previous standards.

**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 2011-12, 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)	94.00
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	6.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 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)	___ 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)	___ Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	___ 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	___ Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	___ 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	___ No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	___ 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	___ Yes
Other	___ No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 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	S	343,618	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	492	>=99
Asian	S	4,755	>=99
Black or African American	S	36,948	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	13,792	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	273	>=98
White	S	279,638	>=99
Two or more races	S	7,720	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	41,249	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	7,216	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	197,376	>=99
Migratory students	S	611	>=99
Male	S	175,780	>=99
Female	S	167,488	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,907	38.56
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,603	52.37
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,739	9.06
Total	41,249	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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	S	350,430	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	494	>=99
Asian	S	4,622	96
Black or African American	S	37,480	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	13,772	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	278	>=98
White	S	286,024	>=99
Two or more races	S	7,760	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	42,309	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,846	94
Economically disadvantaged students	S	202,284	>=99
Migratory students	S	611	98
Male	S	179,645	>=99
Female	S	170,580	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students that are first-year LEP (which also impacts the Asian count) are included in the enrollment count but are not counted as participating on the test since they are not required to take the test. Again, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander were not reported due to there being low counts in these categories; thus, Kentucky submitted these counts with the "Missing" category.			

**1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	
--	--

**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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	16,288	38.50
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	22,310	52.73
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,711	8.77
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	42,309	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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	S	145,484	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	199	>=98
Asian	S	1,846	98
Black or African American	S	15,516	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	5,462	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	105	>=98
White	S	118,867	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,489	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	16,539	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,571	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	82,042	>=99
Migratory students	S	226	>=98
Male	S	74,442	>=99
Female	S	70,684	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	6,760	40.87
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,227	49.74
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,552	9.38
Total	16,539	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,041	S	43
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	S	36
Asian	806	S	67
Black or African American	5,341	S	25
Hispanic or Latino	2,544	S	33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	49
White	40,954	S	45
Two or more races	1,285	S	36
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,253	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,867	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	31,071	S	32
Migratory students	120	S	25
Male	26,033	S	43
Female	25,001	S	43
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	50,964	S	49
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	S	41
Asian	782	S	65
Black or African American	5,329	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	2,509	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	49
White	40,949	S	53
Two or more races	1,285	S	42
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,253	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,798	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	31,016	S	39
Migratory students	119	S	24
Male	25,993	S	46
Female	24,964	S	53
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is assessed at the 4th grade, so there is no data for grade 3.			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,916	S	40
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	S	43
Asian	709	S	65
Black or African American	5,432	S	21
Hispanic or Latino	2,417	S	28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	33	S	55
White	40,021	S	43
Two or more races	1,229	S	32
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,662	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,318	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	30,076	S	29
Migratory students	114	S	26
Male	25,652	S	40
Female	24,261	S	39
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,825	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	S	42
Asian	682	S	62
Black or African American	5,420	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	2,376	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	33	S	48
White	40,012	S	51
Two or more races	1,228	S	39
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,662	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,237	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	30,013	S	36
Migratory students	111	S	30
Male	25,598	S	44
Female	24,224	S	50
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,855	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	S	70
Asian	692	S	78
Black or African American	5,421	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	2,396	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	33	S	70
White	40,011	S	73
Two or more races	1,228	S	61
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,661	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,276	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	30,034	S	59
Migratory students	114	S	58
Male	25,618	S	69
Female	24,234	S	68
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,368	S	39
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	S	30
Asian	765	S	66
Black or African American	5,528	S	21
Hispanic or Latino	2,237	S	30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	34
White	41,550	S	41
Two or more races	1,168	S	34
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,717	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,121	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	30,597	S	28
Migratory students	116	S	23
Male	26,390	S	39
Female	24,973	S	39
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,286	S	48
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	S	40
Asian	739	S	64
Black or African American	5,515	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	2,209	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	53	S	55
White	41,542	S	50
Two or more races	1,165	S	44
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,717	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,047	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	30,538	S	36
Migratory students	114	S	29
Male	26,344	S	47
Female	24,937	S	48
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is assessed at the 4th grade, so there is no data for grade 5.			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	50,951	S	42
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	S	36
Asian	710	S	66
Black or African American	5,554	S	21
Hispanic or Latino	1,927	S	31
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	33	S	39
White	41,529	S	45
Two or more races	1,122	S	33
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,042	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	889	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	29,680	S	30
Migratory students	84	S	27
Male	26,280	S	39
Female	24,668	S	45
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	50,879	S	46
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	S	38
Asian	683	S	60
Black or African American	5,544	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	1,898	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	34	S	53
White	41,522	S	49
Two or more races	1,122	S	40
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,039	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	838	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	29,629	S	34
Migratory students	82	S	17
Male	26,245	S	41
Female	24,631	S	51
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is assessed at the 7th grade, so there is no data for grade 6.			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,944	S	39
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	S	30
Asian	621	S	62
Black or African American	5,325	S	18
Hispanic or Latino	1,734	S	29
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	40	S	33
White	41,125	S	42
Two or more races	1,033	S	32
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,607	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	793	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	28,446	S	26
Migratory students	73	S	16
Male	25,650	S	38
Female	24,293	S	39

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,896	S	48
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	S	50
Asian	598	S	59
Black or African American	5,318	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	1,715	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	40	S	43
White	41,126	S	51
Two or more races	1,033	S	45
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,606	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	748	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	28,410	S	36
Migratory students	71	S	27
Male	25,625	S	43
Female	24,270	S	53

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,909	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	S	65
Asian	611	S	72
Black or African American	5,319	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	1,728	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	41	S	51
White	41,113	S	65
Two or more races	1,031	S	56
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,605	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	778	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	28,418	S	50
Migratory students	72	S	44
Male	25,632	S	62
Female	24,276	S	61

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,772	S	42
American Indian or Alaska Native	77	S	42
Asian	583	S	68
Black or African American	5,343	S	22
Hispanic or Latino	1,678	S	34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	S	43
White	41,080	S	44
Two or more races	967	S	35
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,378	S	13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	738	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	27,812	S	29
Migratory students	71	S	20
Male	25,338	S	40
Female	24,425	S	43

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	49,750	S	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	77	S	47
Asian	568	S	59
Black or African American	5,339	S	25
Hispanic or Latino	1,670	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	44	S	41
White	41,085	S	50
Two or more races	967	S	40
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,382	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	707	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	27,797	S	35
Migratory students	72	S	31
Male	25,330	S	42
Female	24,412	S	51

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is assessed at the 7th grade, so there is no data for 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	40,626	S	40
American Indian or Alaska Native	60	S	25
Asian	561	S	67
Black or African American	4,425	S	24
Hispanic or Latino	1,255	S	35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	S	47
White	33,379	S	42
Two or more races	916	S	30
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,590	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	490	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	19,694	S	28
Migratory students	33	S	30
Male	20,437	S	39
Female	19,867	S	42

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

**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	47,830	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	S	48
Asian	570	S	62
Black or African American	5,015	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	1,395	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	43
White	39,788	S	55
Two or more races	960	S	41
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,650	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	471	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	24,881	S	39
Migratory students	42	S	36
Male	24,510	S	44
Female	23,142	S	61

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,720	S	30
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	S	24
Asian	543	S	51
Black or African American	4,776	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	1,338	S	24
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	S	23
White	37,743	S	32
Two or more races	1,230	S	18
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,273	S	4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	517	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	23,590	S	18
Migratory students	40	S	13
Male	23,192	S	30
Female	22,174	S	30

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total of the male and female count may not equal the all students count because of incomplete student coding by districts. Any comparison to data from prior years should be made with caution because of implementation of a new assessment and accountability system this year.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,565		
Districts	194		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Comment #1: The numbers of schools and districts reported in column 1 are inaccurate due to a USDOE data issue. Since Kentucky is a flexibility waiver state, the numbers of schools and districts are being pulled from a general directory file causing the figures in the first column above to not be correct. Candy Johnson, Kentucky's EDEN data person, was told that USDOE would go in and make the corrections to these numbers and that Kentucky is to include the correct numbers in the comment section. Thus, the numbers that should appear in the first column for the actual numbers of accountability schools and districts is 1,171 schools and 174 districts.

Comment #2: As to no data being filled in for the second and third columns above, Kentucky received a flexibility waiver from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Per a Nov. 27 e-mail from Lynn Bond, EDEN contractor, it was verified that states with ESEA flexibility waivers will no longer be determining if a school or district has made Adequate Yearly Progress, and therefore, the second and third columns above are left blank.

**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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	878		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	858		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	19		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. As to no data being filled in for the second and third columns above, Kentucky received a flexibility waiver from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Per a Nov. 27 e-mail from Lynn Bond, EDEN contractor, it was verified that states with ESEA flexibility waivers will no longer be determining if a school has made Adequate Yearly Progress, and therefore, the second and third columns above are left blank.

**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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
174		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Comment #1: As to no data being filled in for the second and third columns above, Kentucky received a flexibility waiver from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Per a Nov. 27 e-mail from Lynn Bond, EDEN contractor, it was verified that states with ESEA flexibility waivers will no longer be determining if a school or district has made Adequate Yearly Progress, and therefore, the second and third columns above are left blank.

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	16
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	4
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	14
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	15
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	10
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	9
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Other restructuring activities include:

- Deploying activities consistent with Section 1003(g) school improvement grants;
- Increasing the use of effective and consistent professional learning communities; and
- Increasing district oversight through weekly meetings between administrators and teachers concerning RTI and instructional strategies.

**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.

Districts that were in improvement status were required to revise their district improvement plans and post the plans on their websites. These 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 for approval, post the plan on the district's website and defer a percentage of the district's Title I, Part A allocation to be used in the implementation of the corrective action plan. Deferred funds were used to address needs identified within the corrective action plan and could not be spent until the SEA approved the plan. In addition, districts in year five of corrective action received ongoing assistance from SEA educational recovery staff in addressing identified needs. All improvement and corrective action districts had opportunities to participate in professional development provided by various offices within the Kentucky Department of Education.

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	25
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	8
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	14
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
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	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
---	--

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

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 2011-12.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During SY2011-12, the state provided technical assistance to schools awarded 1003(g) funds via SEA Educational Recovery staff. Educational Recovery staff were responsible for helping to identify needs, develop and carry out a plan to meet those needs and build capacity within the school, and monitor the school's progress in meeting those needs and improving student achievement.

Evaluation of the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant program was provided through a contract awarded to the University of Kentucky.

**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 2011-12 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 received professional development from offices across the Kentucky Department of Education, content leadership networks, leadership academies, and various other sources.

## 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.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	92,923
Applied to transfer	1,033
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	771
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 789,699

**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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	89

**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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The LEAs were unable to provide public school choice for the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring;
2. The LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice;
3. The LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impractical; or
4. The LEAs offered school choice, but nobody took advantage of the offer.

<sup>3</sup> 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*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	40,560
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,771
Received supplemental educational services	2,897
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,632,208
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	195,143	193,654	99.24	1,489	0.76
All elementary classes	78,007	77,832	99.78	175	0.22
All secondary classes	117,136	115,822	98.88	1,314	1.12

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

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

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	1.00
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	74.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	30.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	60.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

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.

**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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	13,598	13,577	99.85
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	20,875	20,856	99.91
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	16,087	16,010	99.52
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	29,806	29,605	99.33

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	74.50	49.90
Poverty metric used	Percentage of free and reduced lunch students.	
Secondary schools	67.90	40.40
Poverty metric used	Percentage of free and reduced lunch students.	

**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

- A. *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.
- B. *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.
- C. *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.
- D. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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"/> Yes	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.

Other types of programs include the following: push-in, content-area tutoring and Newcomer Centers for Middle and High School English Learners.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	18,579
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 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.

	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	18,579
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 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	11,595
Arabic	750
Somali	720
Chinese	502
Japanese	415

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 students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	17,986
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	194
Total	18,180
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,533
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14.01
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency 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	16,784
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	177
Total	16,961
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 18,579 is the number of students served by Title III districts. Students can remain in the LEP program after they have tested out but are no longer assessed by ACCESS. In addition, the number of students served by Title III is for the entire year and the number tested (16,784) are the students enrolled during the LEP ACCESS testing window. So, the count of students and the number of students tested are not the same and cannot be compared.</p> <p>Breakdown by grade for the 16,784 is as follows:            Grade Frequency            00 2801            01 2754            02 2217            03 1899            04 1288            05 1073            06 850            07 757            08 728            09 891            10 616            11 538            12 372</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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

	#
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.	4,611

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students 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%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	4,804	39.46	6,577	54.00
Attained proficiency	2,372	14.13	839	5.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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 (MFLEP) 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
1,667	1,744	3,411
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,123	S	51	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,167	S	55	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
1,292	S	64	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

### 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	40
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	37
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Kentucky received a flexibility waiver from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). It was verified in a Nov. 27 e-mail from Lynn Bond, an EDEN contractor, that states with ESEA flexibility waivers no longer will be determining if schools make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and are not required to report AYP status.

Additionally, each consortium is counted as one sub-grantee.

#### 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	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

#### 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?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
4,444	564	5

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 educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.	176
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	375

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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	29	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	20	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	23	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	12	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	30	2,509
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	23	381
PD provided to principals	21	129
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	26	321
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	20	235
PD provided to community based organization personnel	6	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>3,594</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of professional development activities included:

- EL Professional Development (PD) for teachers on Survival, Communication, Emergency, & Essential Language for Classrooms & Parents
- Interpreting ACCESS results and WIDA website tools and resources
- Differentiation for the EL Students; hosted by our consortia
- The district provided training for EL teachers and staff in the Springer School Multi-Sensory Approach to Reading Strategies (MAS).
- Kentucky Common Core Standards PD (several school districts were involved in Common Core PD initiatives)
- Coaching sessions were completed at the elementary level. The EL teacher observed general education classroom teachers during times in which the general education teachers felt they needed strategies to better serve the EL students in their classrooms. The EL teacher then provided coaching and her observations for improvement. Teachers and principals alike appreciated this input.

The coaching was targeted to meet each teacher's individual need(s). Twenty general education teachers were involved in the coaching sessions.

- The Northern Kentucky ESL consultants established a working relationship with the general education classroom teachers within their region at the beginning of the school year. The ESL consultants provided the teachers with information regarding their EL students' educational and home language backgrounds, reviewed the modifications and accommodations outlined in the students' Program Services Plans (PSPs), and answered any questions that the teachers had regarding implementation of the PSPs. The teachers and consultants remained in contact throughout the school

year. The general education teachers contacted the consultants when they had questions about educational decisions regarding EL students and the consultants contacted the teachers to ensure implementation of the PSPs and to closely monitor student progress. The NKCES ESL consultants also met with mainstream teachers when needed to suggest strategies that would benefit LEP students in the classroom including methods of differentiating instruction as well as appropriate accommodations and modifications.

### 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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

##### 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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/11	2/29/12	163
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Revisions to the new data verification system were implemented to ensure accurate numbers were reported from the districts to the SEA; thus, the average number of days for the state to make subgrants increased.		

#### 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.

Revisions to the new data verification process have been fully implemented. The number of days for distributing Title III funds to subgrantees will shorten because the final Title III data will be reported to the Division of Budgets earlier. WebEx trainings on data entry were conducted during the 2011-2012 school year. Six regional face-to-face end-of-year professional development opportunities on correct data entry were held for EL Coordinators. By increasing the training and SEA to district dialogue, schools/districts will have fewer errors in data entry. Therefore, there will be less time necessary to complete the verification process.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	158	145
LEAs with subgrants	16	16
Total	174	161
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	579	735
K	1,585	1,447
1	1,433	1,444
2	1,210	1,390
3	1,239	1,439
4	1,162	1,427
5	1,086	1,404
6	990	1,555
7	864	1,613
8	828	1,686
9	756	2,372
10	820	1,963
11	719	1,543
12	800	1,540
Ungraded	2	27
Total	14,073	21,585

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,968	5,862
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	10,666	14,784
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	965	640
Hotels/Motels	474	299
Total	14,073	21,585

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 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 Birth Through 2	38
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	735
K	1,447
1	1,444
2	1,390
3	1,439
4	1,427
5	1,404
6	1,555
7	1,613
8	1,686
9	2,372
10	1,963
11	1,543
12	1,540
Ungraded	27
Total	21,623
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 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 homeless youth	742
Migratory children/youth	24
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,239
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	593
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	2,007	704
4	2,023	641
5	1,908	592
6	1,876	521
7	1,710	507
8	1,687	494
High School	1,423	521

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	2,011	531
4	2,028	455
5	1,911	429
6	1,880	469
7	1,713	365
8	1,690	406
High School	1,063	302

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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		
4	2,026	1,049
5		
6		
7	1,710	733
8		
High School	1,101	158

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	740
K	332
1	290
2	244
3	221
4	190
5	178
6	160
7	137
8	134
9	142
10	93
11	61
12	38
Ungraded	16
Out-of-school	992
Total	3,968

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This data has been verified by the migrant database, MIS 2000.

**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 child count has only decreased by 3%; so, there is no need for an explanation.

**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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	239
K	138
1	156
2	149
3	147
4	94
5	122
6	103
7	77
8	63
9	63
10	54
11	37
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	83
Total	1,541

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This data has been verified by 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 child count increased by approximately 9%. The KYMEP has encouraged districts and regional programs to offer summer programming for students. Additionally, the KYMEP required districts and regions to provide a summer budget to be used to provide exceptional summer programming to encourage a continuation of programs. Due to the fact that all districts were required to provide a summer program and were required to include it in their budgets, more districts were able to provide summer programs. All of these factors contributed to the slight 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.

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

### 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 were collected 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 is now one category. Priority for Service students are those that are 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, and at least two to three of the following: has a current IEP or 504 plan, received a score less than 5 on the WIDAWAPT ACCESS test, received a D or F in core content classes, scored novice on the state assessment, 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 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's 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 is 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 has 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's 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 is 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 "Advising" 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 are 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.

Migrant Advocates should update a student's needs assessment form in the event of any changes that may have occurred in the child's academic year. These changes are updated using a red pen and sent to the regional office throughout the school year. These forms document the PFS throughout the school year.

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 5/15/12 - 09/01/12 were identified for summer school/intersession. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicates 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 9/1/11 through 8/31/12, MIS2000 developed a report for Kentucky determining the number of students. The report looked at the QAD being designated 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 5/15/12 through 9/01/12 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 the recruiters and advocates. 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 colored seal. This is the third year of doing this. The national COE Kentucky began using on 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 and another copy is sent to the state for its files. If the family still resides within the district during the remaining two years of eligibility, a parent's 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 has 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 that 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 an MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 5/15/12-9/01/12 as the start and end dates indicating a child has at least attended one day of summer school or intersession. The report asks that the QAD be within three years of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the end date; the 22nd birthday is greater than the end date; the termination, funding, withdrawal, residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding date; 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 receives 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 dates of birth, close dates of birth, dates of birth plus last or first name matched dates of birth, first names of 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 bi-monthly. 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 birth place, parent names, 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.

Kentucky's districts use Infinite Campus. Kentucky has generated a list of migrant students from Infinite Campus and added their MIS2000 IDs. This year is the second year that Kentucky has implemented the "migrant tab" in Infinite Campus. This tab allows only the people using the "state edition" of Infinite Campus to mark students as migrant or not. This will cut down on districts marking students as migrant that are not truly migrant.

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 of 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 and regional coordinators. 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 yearly. Training has been provided to all

recruiters at the fall academy and at state sessions and/or on a one-on-one basis. SEA staff will randomly check eligibility decisions of recruiters during monitoring visits to regional projects through reviews of original COEs. The SEA holds two blitzes yearly to ensure training of new recruiters, shadowing recruiters, and ensure quality recruiting practices. Regional MEP Coordinators 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; and 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 office. Guidance is annually sent out to regional records clerks concerning collecting and reporting of 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 since 2009. Every third year the re-interviews will be conducted by an outside entity. The Kentucky Migrant Education Program re-interview procedures are as follows:

1. The State Consultant will run the random student sample report from MIS2000 to generate a random computerized list of students from that region.
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, 9/1/2011 - present.
  - 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.

For 2011, the SEA had ESCORT complete Kentucky's outside re-interviews on November 7-11, 2011. The state consultant pulled a random student sample of 50 students and another random student sample of 100 students to use as alternates, if needed. Out of the overall 150, 58 were used, 30 from the regular random student sample, and 28 from the alternate student sample. Once ESCORT completed the re-interviews across the state, the review panel composed of three out-of-state independent ID&R experts reviewed the COEs and Re-Interview forms. The initial determinations by the review panel determined: 29 eligible, 15 eligible but needed more information, 14 needed more information and 0 not eligible. Then, the regions had 30 days to contest the findings. After this appeal review, it was determined that all 58 students that were reinterviewed were indeed eligible. There was 0% that were not eligible.

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 coordinators call on families from the COEs.

Kentucky also updates merges according to MSIX. When two students from Kentucky are merged in MSIX, they also

are merged in MIS2000. This ensures that the data is consistent in both databases.

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 consultant for records/recruitment to make sure that the process for 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.

Kentucky's districts use Infinite Campus. Kentucky has generated a list of migrant students from Infinite Campus and added their personally generated MIS2000 ID. 2011 was the first year that Kentucky implemented the "migrant tab" in Infinite Campus. This tab allows only the people using the "state edition" of Infinite Campus to mark students as migrant or not. Now, when a clerk receives a COE and inputs the data into MIS2000, they also check the migrant box in Infinite Campus to identify the school-aged children. The clerks can check the adhocks in Infinite Campus to see that the student counts are accurate in each district as well. They can also do an adhock report to see if the students marked as migrant have their MIS2000 IDs or not. This further assists with the accurate Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

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 regions have also paired new recruiters with experienced recruiters for on-the-job training.

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. The state will offer trainings for advanced eligibility determinations to assist recruiters that have more experience.

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 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 the state ID&R coordinator and/or regional coordinator will occur. 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 Process supports the accuracy of this child count.