

**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 2015-16**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016**  
**PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017**

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

**PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION**

**SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.**

## 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) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

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

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

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

### **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Kentucky Department of Education		
Address: 300 Sower Blvd., 5th Floor Frankfort, Kentucky 40601		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Mary Ann Miller		
Telephone: 502-564-3141		
Fax: 502-564-5680		
e-mail: MaryAnn.Miller@education.ky.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Stephen Pruitt		
		<u>Wednesday, March 29, 2017, 10:33:38 AM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017  
5PM EST**

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

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

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

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

**2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)**

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	45,037	S	45.6
4	43,483	S	49.2
5	41,978	S	53.4
6	32,520	S	46.7
7	30,506	S	41.3
8	30,014	S	42.0
High School	15,307	S	38.2
Total	238,845	S	46.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	44,880	S	51.8
4	43,352	S	54.2
5	41,836	S	55.8
6	32,390	S	52.7
7	30,388	S	53.6
8	29,871	S	51.1
High School	17,275	S	50.3
Total	239,992	S	53.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	686	S	55
4	722	S	69
5	691	S	68
6	304	S	70
7	174	S	66
8	161	S	64
High School	283	S	74
Total	3,021	S	65.8

**Comments:**

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	683	S	64
4	720	S	72
5	691	S	70
6	303	S	74
7	174	S	75
8	161	S	66
High School	237	S	81
Total	2,969	S	70

**Comments:**

**2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation**

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

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

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

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	81,465
Limited English proficient students	20,480
Students who are homeless	22,967
Migratory students	2,228
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	631
Asian	5,900
Black or African American	57,133
Hispanic or Latino	33,273
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	607
White	383,102
Two or more races	18,642
Total	499,288
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	261	0	0	261
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	66	22,545	32	0	22,643
K	176	48,480	175	0	48,831
1	233	51,966	218	2	52,419
2	217	50,665	233	10	51,125
3	196	50,030	215	17	50,458
4	220	48,187	246	32	48,685
5	180	46,148	232	30	46,590
6	179	35,672	204	43	36,098
7	136	33,694	160	79	34,069
8	134	33,117	138	101	33,490
9	9	21,387	68	153	21,617
10	7	20,095	62	189	20,353
11	12	17,965	57	121	18,155
12	6	17,130	42	50	17,228
Ungraded	0	175	1	4	180
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,771</b>	<b>497,517</b>	<b>2,083</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>502,202</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

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

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

<b>TAS Instructional Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	364
Reading/language arts	523
Science	0
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	13
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>TAS Support Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	35
Other support services	29
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	11.22	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	4.00	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	1.00	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
- (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
  - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
  - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
  - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
  - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
  - (6) Acting as a translator; or
  - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

**2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs**

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>	583.97	100.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

**2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A**

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2015 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

<b>Parental Involvement Reservation</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000</b>
Number of LEAs*	60	113
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	129,180	4,839,148
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	16,019,825	184,358,772
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.81	2.62

\*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocation.

**In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2015-16.**

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts and schools used parent involvement funds in many ways including the printing of parent involvement communications, the fostering of parent/school relationships, providing parents with the skills necessary to successfully help their children with school work, requiring staff to conduct home visits, and the employment of parent involvement coordinators.

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- ┆ Population data of eligible migrant children
- ┆ Academic data of eligible migrant students
- ┆ Data of migrant children served during the performance period
- ┆ School data
- ┆ Project data
- ┆ Personnel data

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period.

#### 2.3.1 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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

**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:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children 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 in the previous performance period (September 1, 2014 - August 31, 2015), youth who are working on a HSED 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. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *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 HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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 and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The EDEN reports are pulled from our database, MIS2000. These reports have been pulled using a snapshot of the database on 11-29-2016. We used the English Learner and special education (Disability) numbers from Infinite Campus, our state database to capture a more accurate number.

#### 2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	567
K	281
1	312
2	274
3	259
4	225
5	193
6	187
7	177
8	150

9	182
10	144
11	89
12	58
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	939
Total	4,037

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database. We have increased 30 students from last year.

#### 2.3.1.1.1 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.

**Comments:** The 2015-16 count increased by 30 students from 2014-15, which is not greater than ten percent.

#### 2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	248

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)**

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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance 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).
- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	355
K	189
1	206
2	183
3	178
4	135
5	129
6	122
7	109
8	96
9	105
10	79
11	43
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	178
Total	2,110

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.1.2.1 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.

**Comments:** There was an increase in the total number of eligible students enrolled in the KYMEP from the 2014-15 school year to the 2015-16 school year. Since there were more eligible students to receive services, the program served more students. There was an 8% increase in the percent of eligible students served in the summer, 42.5% up to 50.3%. In addition to having more students to serve, the new Service Delivery Plan (SDP) outlines service delivery expectations for all age groups, which leads to an increase in the percent of preschool age students being served by the MEP. The new SDP was developed and implemented immediately before the FY17 summer term.

**2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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.

Do not include:

- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	56

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
NGS	<u>No</u>
MIS 2000	<u>Yes</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>No</u>

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<u>Yes</u>

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period . In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- | The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- | Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity).
- | Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky generates the CAT1 and CAT2 reports for CSPR using MIS2000. Once a query is run, the database can filter out any child who did not meet specified criteria during the child count period. The CAT1 report uses the start and end dates of 9/1/15 through 8/31/16 to determine the number of eligible students. The report asks that the QAD be within three years of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the withdraw and end date; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding and end date; and the termination, funding, withdrawal, residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates. Students who turn three during the performance period are counted in the under 3 category unless they have a MEP-provided service recorded during the performance period after their third birthday, have a verification date, residency date, or enrollment date after their third birthday. Only then are they counted in the 3to5 NotK category.

In the case of Category 2, using a MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 9/1/15 to 8/31/16 as the start and end dates with the "End of Regular Year" as 6/15/16, indicating a child has attended at least 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 withdraw and end date; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding and end date; and that the termination, funding, withdrawal, residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates. 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 identification number. Before the clerk enters children into the database, a program written into MIS2000 allows the clerks 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 similar names will appear. The clerk then determines if the list contains any newly enrolled child's name by verifying the birthdate, birth place, parent's name and/or the latest school attended.

To verify that all children resided in the state at least one day during the performance period, a verification signature, or a new COE for children with a QAD during the performance period, is collected on all children included in the CAT1 count. Any students whose residence in the district cannot be verified either directly from the MEP staff or by a reliable source such as school personnel, landlord, or employer, have their enrollment line removed from the database. Verification signatures are collected at the bottom of the COE signed by the family. Original COEs with the color logo are filed at the regional migrant office, one copy is sent to the state office, and another copy with the SEA authorized signature is returned to the program for verification signatures. If the family still resides within the district during the remaining three years of eligibility, a parent's signature is obtained at the bottom of the COE once during each funding year to forward to the state office. The students' names from the COEs along with the parents' signatures are matched with the unduplicated list of students used for the child count to validate residence within Kentucky. The original verified COEs are sent to KDE for retention.

We send current enrollment reports (including birthday and grades) to migrant district personnel to review on a monthly basis. If a student on the report has moved, graduated, obtained a GED, or died, the district withdraws the student and documents the graduation, death or moving date. Districts are also expected to complete a needs assessment within two weeks of a child turning three or starting a new enrollment. Districts receive a monthly report showing students' grade/age and if they have a completed needs assessment. Any 3 year old students that do not have a completed needs assessment are questioned until withdrawn or assessed.

Once a student has been entered into MIS2000, an on-going procedure is used to eliminate any duplicates. Every records clerk runs a "Potential Duplicate Student" report quarterly and the KDE consultant runs the report monthly. The PDS report looks at matching birthdates, close birthdates, birthdates and last or first name, first name of potentially adopted duplicates and the same student number. If the clerk finds duplicate students, an e-mail is sent to the state consultant for the records to be merged. The student number to be kept is identified (usually the oldest). If the state consultant cannot determine which student number to retain, the local migrant projects are consulted and the determination is made from there. Kentucky is confident that unique identification numbers are assigned for each child. The MIS2000 child counts can determine this from selected factors, such as birthplace, parents' names, and student names and the child will be counted one time for funding purposes. MSIX also helps to determine potential duplicate students. The state consultant determines merges for migrant students in MSIX, and if necessary, updates of the MIS2000 database are done 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 sixth year Kentucky has implemented the "migrant tab" in Infinite Campus, which allows only the people using the "state edition" of Infinite Campus to mark students as migrant or not. This has improved the identification of migrant students for state reporting. Quarterly data checks are performed to compare Infinite Campus to MIS2000.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

MIS2000 is the system that transmits migrant data to the Kentucky Department of Education. Nightly at 2:00 - 3:00 AM, MIS2000 uploads directly to MSIX. Since the information is submitted nightly, we can ensure that MSIX has the most up-to-date information regarding Kentucky migrant students.

Kentucky consultants pull the EDEN reports from MIS2000 directly each year. We verify the data with last year's data to check for accuracy and to ensure that the data submitted makes sense. In the event that there is an issue, we will review the report specifications in MIS2000 and work to resolve any issues that may cause the report to be inaccurate.

<b>Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	Yes

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MSIX also helps to determine potential duplicate students. The state consultants then will determine which records should be merged in MSIX, and if

necessary, updates to the MIS2000 database are conducted. Kentucky desires to ensure that our migrant child counts are accurate; therefore, when two records are merged from Kentucky in MSIX, we also ensure the records are merged in the MIS2000 database.

Some of our recruiters use MSIX to verify the student's moves from one location to another. Recently MSIX was used to verify that the student missed ten or more days due to the migratory lifestyle. State consultants were able to look at the withdrawal dates and enrollment dates from the previous state to determine that the child did not miss ten or more days due to the migratory lifestyle. We then updated the needs assessment to make sure that our data was accurate.

**2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	Yes
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	Yes
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	Yes
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	Yes
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	Yes
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/intersession projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	No
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	Yes
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	Yes
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	Yes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	200
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	69
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	69

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This was the third year for Kentucky to use the current internal re-interview process. Kentucky developed a three-year schedule where each of the five regions will perform re-interviews in a different region each year on a rotating basis. The five regions chose which month they wanted to perform re-interviews. Then, a week before re-interviews, the region conducting re-interviews contacted the state consultant to pull a random student sample from the state database. The Kentucky Migrant Education Program (KY MEP) 2015-2016 re-interview effort intended to complete at least 50 re-interviews from the migrant student population in the state for the 2015-16 reporting period. The re-interview effort successfully completed 69 re-interviews, more than the recommended amount by the Office of Migrant Education (OME). A total of 39 interviews were attempted, resulting in a 63.89% response rate (69 out of 108).

The sample consisted of 10 children identified as the main sample and 40 additional children selected as the alternate sample (for each of the five regions). A total of 69 children from the total sample of 200 were interviewed.

The following table shows the non-response results.

Response Rate Table  
 Number of interviews attempted 39  
 Number of interviews completed 69  
 Non-Responses 92

6 of the non-response but attempted children had moved away, while 4 were not found by the re-interview teams. None of those attempted declined to be interviewed.

The re-interview was conducted five different weeks throughout the performance period. The sample was randomly selected from children reported in the 2015-16 school year by Kentucky as eligible and for whom a new Certificate of Eligibility (COE) [prompted by a new qualifying arrival date] had been completed within the timeframe.

Procedures	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	SY 2014-15
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

**FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:**

- a. *What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migrant children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migrant children.

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sampling method used for the KY MEP 2015-16 re-interview was stratified by region. The State Education Agency (SEA) provided a list of randomly selected children - 10 as the main sample and 30 as the alternate sample to each of the regions conducting re-interviews. All the children in the sample were obtained from the total number of children in the state's database at the time the data was pulled one week prior to re-interviewing. Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sample size drawn for this study was a set of 10 children, plus an additional set of 30 alternates for each of the five regions, totaling 200 children. The pool of children, ages 3-21, were randomly selected by the KY MEP from a sampling universe of children whose eligibility was newly determined during the current year (September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016).

The data selected were children who were initially eligible for the 2015 count at this time and who had a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) during the performance period. The universe of child names were each assigned a random number using a random number generator. The names were then ordered by the random number from the least to the greatest number. The draw was used to select the first 10 children for each region and the second 30 children to be used as replacements as needed.

The use of this sampling method guaranteed that every migrant child in the state had the same probability of being selected for this study's sample.

During the re-interview, each region had a team that received a sample list divided by districts throughout the region. The lists included both main and alternate children. Re-interviewers were instructed to ensure that all the children in the main sample were interviewed or documented if they couldn't be found. They were asked to make two to three attempts before indicating on the re-interview form that they were unable to find the family. In some instances, the recruiters were able to determine that the family had moved away, either because there were new tenants in the building or neighbors told the interviewers.

When a sample was not found, an attempt was made to conduct a phone interview if a reliable phone number was accessible. Otherwise, the re-interviewer selected a name from the alternate sample list. Since all the children in the sample were randomly selected and organized by district, the re-interviewer was able to select an alternate from the same area.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The KY MEP 2015-2016 internal re-interview occurred at each of the five regions throughout the performance period of September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016. A total of 69 re-interviews were conducted from a region-wide sample of randomly selected migrant children. After revising all the completed forms and clarifying information provided by the region, a review panel determined that 69 children in the sample were eligible for a .0% defect rate.

During the review, the panel found a few COE quality control issues. Although these issues did not affect the eligibility of any child in the sample, the external agency provided a summary of these and offered recommendations for improving quality control to the KY MEP.

**COE Errors**

- Child Data - Child's full name was not written properly on the COE in some cases. These have since been updated in our database correctly.
- Moves "From/To" - The review panel had difficulty identifying where the child had moved "from" or "to", and/or where work was obtained in a few cases. The difficulty occurred as the panel compared the COEs to the notes from the re-interviewer.
- Qualifying Arrival Date - Acknowledging that families (particularly those with higher rates of mobility) have difficulty remembering exact dates and there was a QAD discrepancy between the COE and the re-interview form in a case; all other eligibility factors were correct.
- Qualifying Activity - Acknowledging that the nature of the qualifying work can change depending on crop cycle and there was a qualifying activity discrepancy between the COE and the re-interview form in a few cases; all other eligibility factors were correct.

The KY MEP was able to address all the questions raised by the panel in a satisfactory manner.

**Recommendations**

- Train recruitment staff across the KY MEP to complete Section II Child Data of the COE accurately. A name written incorrectly on the COE will likely result in creating a duplicate record in the Migrant Student Records Exchange Initiative (MSIX) that will require correction by the MSIX data administrator in the merge reports section. We will also verify this information with the clerks during re-interview training.
- Train recruitment staff across the KY MEP to ask sufficient probing questions to obtain the full names of all eligible children in the household. If one child made a move with the worker and one child made a "to join" move, each child will have a separate COE; however, best practice would be to add cross-referenced notes on both COEs. This would ease confusion if either child is chosen randomly for a re-interview. If the qualifying move dates are close together, the parent could forget and say they all moved together (or all the children moved "to join" the worker). Having the cross-referenced notes on the COEs would prompt the re-interviewer to ask additional questions, if needed.
- Train recruitment staff across the KY MEP to ask sufficient probing questions to determine move history and to accurately complete Section III on the COE including the right order for "from" and "to" information and correct QAD. The upcoming re-interviews will use a new form which should help with this as well.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)? Yes

### 2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

#### 2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	26
1	38
2	33
3	24
4	30
5	23
6	19
7	29
8	14
9	26
10	20
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	292

**Comments:** The KYMEP experienced an increase in the overall child count, most of which was in the secondary grades of 6-12. The secondary population also is where there was the largest increase in PFS students; where there are more students there will be more needs. In addition to the increase in population, the program has been working to improve the prompt and proper identification and recruitment of eligible students and their needs. The state runs an enrollment report monthly that identifies all students who have been marked migrant in the past four years who have a new enrollment in a school in Kentucky. This report has assisted the program in identifying when migrant students experience an education disruption caused by a move.

#### FAQ on priority for services:

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

**2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	249
K	158
1	170
2	147
3	122
4	95
5	62
6	49
7	50
8	47
9	68
10	50
11	32
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,306

**Comments:** This data is populated from Infinite Campus, the state student information system, and the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also children with disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	56
K	49
1	40
2	41
3	38
4	17
5	22
6	19
7	17
8	15
9	16
10	15
11	6
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>

**Comments:** This data is populated from Infinite Campus, the state student information system, and the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2016 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	140
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	171
K	93
1	89
2	82
3	79
4	64
5	50
6	51
7	66
8	39
9	60
10	41
11	18
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	479
Total	1,537

**Comments:** This data is populated from Infinite Campus, the state student information system, and the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2015-16 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	91
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	136
K	70
1	67
2	61
3	50
4	45
5	33
6	35
7	40
8	26
9	47
10	30
11	9
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	186
Total	933

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	88
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	319
K	180
1	189
2	173
3	143
4	140
5	111
6	114
7	108
8	98
9	114
10	86
11	55
12	30
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	329
Total	2,277

**Comments:** The KYMEP implemented a new service data tracking system in 2014-15 SY that requires each service and referral to be electronically submitted shortly after the service or referral takes place. This new system has taken time for staff to adjust to, which reduced over reporting and may have led to under reporting in 2014-15 SY. As staff become more familiar with the application and the reporting requirements, and the program provides additional training, the data accuracy will improve. Although the number of students receiving a referral has increased, as well as the total number of eligible students in 2015-16, the percentage of eligible students receiving referrals has decreased over the past several years.

**2.3.2.8 Academic Status**

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

**2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts**

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	S
9	4
10	S
11	S
12	S
Ungraded	
Total	11

**Comments:** This data is verified using Infinite Campus State Edition by the Office of Assessment and Accountability.

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

*How is "drop outs" defined?* The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2015-16 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

**2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)**

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g., GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	S

**Comments:** This data is verified using MIS2000, the migrant database.

### 2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to eligible migrant children during the performance period.

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs.
- Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)(2-3))).

#### FAQ on Services:

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

#### 2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	26
1	36
2	31
3	21
4	29
5	23
6	18
7	27
8	14
9	26
10	20
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	281

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	21
1	27
2	27
3	15
4	20
5	15
6	14
7	18
8	10
9	17
10	14
11	3
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	201

**Comments:** There are multiple reasons for the increase in the number of PFS students served during the summer/intersession compared to the previous year. The first reason is due to the fact that there are more students identified as migrant during the performance period and approximately the same percentage of students are Priority For Service, 6.3% in 2014-15 compared to 6.8% in 2015-16. There also was a shift in the actual PFS population. In 2015-16 Kentucky saw a 34% increase in the number of PFS secondary students compared to the prior year. The recent change in regional centers and the fiscal agents also played a role. During 2015-16 one of our regional centers moved to a community college that offers an intensive leadership and college experience camp. Since the regional office moved and the college has become more aware of the Migrant Education Program, it increased the number of students it serves and reserved many spots specifically for Migrant Education Program students. Three regional centers worked together to expand an existing successful college experience camp for middle and high school students. The collaboration resulted in many more migrant PFS and non PFS students receiving services. These changes in addition to the new service expectations outline in our Service Delivery Plan resulted in an increase in all migrant students, including PFS, being served during the summer.

**2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	174
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	524
K	268
1	297
2	264
3	242
4	206
5	186
6	180
7	168
8	145
9	174
10	137
11	85
12	54
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	776
Total	3,880

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	26
1	36
2	31
3	21
4	30
5	23
6	18
7	27
8	14
9	26
10	20
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	282

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Continuation of Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0

**Comments:** This data is populated from the MIS2000 migrant database.

**2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	28
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	222
K	146
1	151
2	130
3	135
4	105
5	100
6	95
7	99
8	73
9	75
10	53
11	26
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	206
Total	1,660

**Comments:** The KYMEP implemented a new service data tracking system in 2014-15 SY that requires each service and referral to be electronically submitted shortly after the service or referral takes place. This new system has taken time for staff to adjust to, which reduced over reporting and may have led to under reporting in 2014-15 SY. As staff become more familiar with the application and the reporting requirements, and the program provides additional training, the data accuracy will improve. Although the number of students receiving a referral has increased, as well as the total number of eligible students in 2015-16, the percentage of eligible students receiving referrals has decreased over the past several years.

**2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	14	7	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	161	133	////////////////////////////////////
K	138	124	////////////////////////////////////
1	145	141	////////////////////////////////////
2	124	114	////////////////////////////////////
3	128	122	////////////////////////////////////
4	97	82	////////////////////////////////////
5	91	85	////////////////////////////////////
6	86	78	////////////////////////////////////
7	91	78	////////////////////////////////////
8	69	65	////////////////////////////////////
9	60	54	5
10	46	37	2
11	20	13	2
12	8	9	1
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	180	146	6
Total	1,458	1,288	16

**Comments:** The KYMEP implemented a new service data tracking system in 2014-15 SY that requires each service and referral to be electronically submitted shortly after the service or referral takes place. This new system has taken time for staff to adjust to, which reduced over reporting and may have led to under reporting in 2014-15 SY. As staff become more familiar with the application and the reporting requirements, and the program provides additional training, the data accuracy will improve. Although the number of students receiving a referral has increased, as well as the total number of eligible students in 2015-16, the percentage of eligible students receiving referrals has decreased over the past several years.

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

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

### 2.3.5.3.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	172	114
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	520	447
K	268	236
1	296	267
2	264	248
3	242	223
4	204	189
5	186	174
6	179	172
7	168	159
8	145	138
9	173	165
10	137	127
11	85	83
12	54	50
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	767	304
Total	3,860	3,096

**Comments:** With the use of the new Web App, we are better able to define and track counseling services. The increase in awareness of what is considered counseling, being able to see how students have been counseled in the past and increased training has provided the MEP staff with more ideas on how to counsel students and improve counseling services to students.

#### FAQs on Support Services:

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

### 2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

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

#### 2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	513
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,324
<b>Comments:</b> This data is populated from the MIS 2000 migrant database.	

#### 2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments:</b> Kentucky does not consolidate MEP funds with the School-wide Program (SWP).	

### 2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	44	4,037
<b>Comments:</b> The data is populated from the FTE database and from reviewing allocations to determine fiscal agents. Each project is only counted once if it has services and a fiscal agent.		

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

**2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data**

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

**2.3.8.1 MEP State Director**

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

<b>State Director FTE</b>	0.40
<b>Comments:</b> This information is populated from the state director.	

**FAQs on the MEP State director**

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

**2.3.8.2 MEP Staff**

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	48	21.06	128	34.64	154
Counselors	3	0.82	0	0.00	3
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	9	4.10	43	16.69	48
Qualified paraprofessionals	46	19.56	52	23.09	81
Recruiters	89	47.99	59	30.05	101
Records transfer staff	6	4.91	5	4.08	8
Administrators	20	9.49	13	6.28	23

**Comments:** Three of our regional offices collaborated to provide an intensive summer camp for middle and high school students. Since there was an abundance of full-time migrant funded staff, there was not a need to hire as many qualified paraprofessionals as in the past. In addition, the program partnered with a local community college to offer a large college experience and leadership camp for many high school students. In the previous years, the program had to hire staff to provide these types of opportunities. However, through this collaboration, the program was able to use the funds for other services since the community college provided the staff for the camp. In addition to the changes in summer camp, the program was no longer able to offer the supplemental funds for summer recruitment and services as it did in 2014-15. This resulted in more full-time MEP staff providing services. The change in summer/intersession headcounts caused the performance period headcount to decrease as well.

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

**FAQs on MEP staff:**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
  1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).
- f. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- g. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.
- h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

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

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

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
  - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

**2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	35	87
Adult corrections	6	62
Other	0	0
Total	41	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:**

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

**2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	35
Adult corrections	6
Other	0
Total	41
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1**

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	2,089	17	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	979	5	0

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	542	0	0
LEP Students	0	0	7	0	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	5	0	0
Asian	0	0	7	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	487	12	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	62	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	2	0	0
White	0	0	1,401	4	0
Two or more races	0	0	125	1	0
Total	0	0	2,089	17	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	1,630	13	0
Female	0	0	459	4	0
Total	0	0	2,089	17	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	8	0	0
12	0	0	51	0	0
13	0	0	123	0	0
14	0	0	223	0	0
15	0	0	362	0	0
16	0	0	505	0	0
17	0	0	559	0	0
18	0	0	213	0	0
19	0	0	39	2	0
20	0	0	5	12	0
21	0	0	1	3	0
Total	0	0	2,089	17	0

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

*What is an unduplicated count?* An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	0	0	2,089	17	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

**2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	0		0		883		S		0	
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED	0	0	0	0	11	S	S	S	0	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	0	0	127	60	S	S	0	0
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	0	0	0	0	1,553	738	S	S	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	0	0	11	10	16	S	0	0
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	0	0	0	0	25	23	S	S	0	0
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	0	0	0	0	368	35	S	S	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0	127	116	S	S	0	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

**2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	139	S	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	98	S	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	148	S	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	281	4	S
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1**

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	125	0	0
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	101	0	0
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	165	S	0
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	280	4	0
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

**2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	9	17
Juvenile corrections	20	71
Other	0	0
Total	29	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

**2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	9
Juvenile corrections	20
Other	0
Total	29
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2**

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	2,707	2,317	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	108	631	0

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	756	751	0
LEP Students	0	0	11	4	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	7	1	0
Asian	0	0	12	5	0
Black or African American	0	0	972	323	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	81	66	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	1	2	0
White	0	0	1,494	1,839	0
Two or more races	0	0	140	81	0
Total	0	0	2,707	2,317	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	2,098	1,368	0
Female	0	0	609	949	0
Total	0	0	2,707	2,317	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	15	0
6	0	0	0	36	0
7	0	0	0	51	0
8	0	0	0	43	0
9	0	0	0	59	0
10	0	0	1	63	0
11	0	0	5	61	0
12	0	0	43	129	0
13	0	0	114	203	0
14	0	0	264	331	0
15	0	0	472	398	0
16	0	0	650	452	0
17	0	0	975	441	0
18	0	0	180	33	0
19	0	0	2	1	0
20	0	0	0	1	0
21	0	0	1	0	0
Total	0	0	2,707	2,317	0

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

--

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

*What is an unduplicated count?* An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	0	0	2,707	2,317	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

**2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	0		0		1,828		1,577		0	
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED	0	0	0	0	S	S	S	S	0	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	0	0	19	19	68	14	0	0
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	0	0	0	0	467	1,464	832	755	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	0	0	S	4	S	9	0	0
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	0	0	0	0	7	10	30	15	0	0
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	0	0	0	0	S	4	200	13	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0	6	20	6	30	0	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2**

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

**2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	17	85	0
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	16	71	0
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	30	111	0
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	21	220	0
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

*Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required?* No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

**2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	16	67	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	14	99	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	28	107	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	26	214	S
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

*Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required?* No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

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

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

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

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	18
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	68
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	0
Parental involvement activities	18
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	87
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	12
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky schools and districts are working to meet rigorous achievement goals that set the standard for preparing all students to be college- and career-ready. Those districts receiving RLIS funds focus efforts toward meeting the specific needs of students requiring interventions through the district's Response to Intervention (RTI) plan. These districts use the RLIS funds to employ school-based interventionists, to lower class size at a particular grade span to further meet the individual student needs and to provide professional development for the instructional and administrative staff in teaching and learning strategies to again further meet the needs of the lowest performing students. A few districts also use the funds to provide additional supplemental activities for English Learner students, primarily those with English as a Second Language in the home. Many districts use these funds for professional development of teachers, with a few school districts using the RLIS funds in activities to provide mentoring and training for new and novice teachers to retain high-quality and highly-skilled teachers in the profession.

As part of the consolidated monitoring process, RLIS funds are being reviewed as it relates to the coordination of funds for student services. With this being a focus for all federal funds, not just primarily RLIS funds, the Kentucky Department of Education has seen an increased focus in the planning and use of these and other funds to address the district's priority needs and the priority needs of the lowest performing students within the district. RLIS fund expenditures also may be noted as a funding source for activities within the district improvement planning process.

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

**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

<b>State Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2015-16?	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	21
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	21	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		21

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2015 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	2,517,073.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		2,517,073.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,517,073.00</b>	<b>2,517,073.00</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*

**2.11 GRADUATION RATES**<sup>4</sup>

This section collects graduation rates.

**2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2015-16). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	48,766	S	88.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	S	83
Asian or Pacific Islander	701	S	93
<i>Asian</i>	653	S	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	48	S	>=90
Black or African American	5,482	S	80.9
Hispanic or Latino	1,994	S	82
White	39,494	S	90.0
Two or more races	1,024	S	87
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,892	S	71.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	612	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	25,265	S	85.6

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

*What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate?* For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 500 characters.

The Children with Disabilities rate is the result of LEA data cleanup with the student information system.

<sup>4</sup> The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

## 2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, *EDFacts* files C106, C107, C109, C111, and C130 (DGs 778 and 779) are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>.

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to *EDFacts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

### 2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

#### 2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools <sup>5</sup> under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

<sup>5</sup> The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

## 2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

### 2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>6</sup>
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

<sup>6</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

### 2.12.3 List of Districts for *ESEA* Flexibility States

#### 2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2016-17 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN034 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses. The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

## 2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

### 2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action<sup>7</sup> under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Improvement status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

<sup>7</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.