

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

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

KENTUCKY



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Kentucky Department of Education	
Address: 500 Mero Street, First Floor, Capital Plaza Tower Frankfort, Kentucky 40601	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Mary Ann Miller	
Telephone: 502-564-3141	
Fax: 502-564-5680	
e-mail: MaryAnn.Miller@education.ky.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jon E. Draud	
_____ Signature	<u>Wednesday, March 5, 2008, 3:11:12 PM</u> Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's Core Content for Assessment 4.1 (CCA 4.1) was adopted by the Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) in 2006. The Core Content is a subset of the content standards in Kentucky's Program of Studies for Grades Primary - 12. It represents the content standards that were assessed with the 2006-07 state assessment in all content areas including reading, mathematics, and science. Since the CCA 4.1 was updated in 2006 and it is measured by the current state assessment, no changes are planned for 2007-08.

The Core Content for Assessment identifies content determined as essential for all students to know. Kentucky's academic content standards were established within the context of nationally recognized content standards and have been nationally recognized in Education Week's "Quality Counts" report. Kentucky meets this standard by measuring the quality of student work against four performance levels. The levels, from lowest to highest, are Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD). The first two levels of performance for reading/language arts, mathematics, science, social studies and writing are subdivided into three levels (Novice non-performance, Novice medium, Novice high, Apprentice low, Apprentice medium and Apprentice high) to better represent student performance.

A series of capacity and goal statements of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990, as found in Kentucky Revised Statutes 158.645 and 158.6451, are the basis for instructional programs in Kentucky's public schools. For example, the statutes require schools to "expect a high level of achievement of all students". That high level, as defined through a standards-setting process designed by respected testing experts of the National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) and overseen by the Kentucky Board of Education (KBE), is the Proficient level.

Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) staff has worked with the Kentucky Board of Education (KBE), Kentucky teachers, and national experts and consultants (including NTAPAA) to update Kentucky's rigorous content standards. KDE staff worked with staff from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) to further refine Kentucky's Core Content for Assessment, including incorporation of Depth of Knowledge. School districts sent content experts to participate in this work over the last two years. The committees, led by the NCIEA staff, focused on developing coherent, rigorous content standards that encourage the teaching of advanced skills.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's 2006-07 implementation plan was based on the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in order to comply with the "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001" requirements to assess reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and once at the high school level and assess science once at each grade span. While Kentucky met NCLB requirements in 2005-06 with an Augmented NRT, the KCCT was redesigned for 2006-07. The redesign included new KCCT assessments in the previously augmented grades of 3,5,6,8 for reading and 3,4,6,7 for math. The redesign included continuing grade span assessment in science at grades 4, 7, 11. The redesign was completed with standard setting and validation process in the summer of 2007. Since the KCCT was redesigned in 2006-07, no changes are planned for 2007-08.

The Core Content for Assessment provided the focus for the development of the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in 2006-07. Each year Kentucky teachers on the Content Advisory Committees use the Core Content for Assessment to write the test items for the state assessment. Kentucky's assessment contractor refines items drafted by Kentucky teachers as needed to ensure that each item meets testing standards.

As the table shows below, science was assessed in each of the required grade ranges as well.

2007 Standards Based (KCCT):

Reading - Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10

Math - Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11

Science - Grade 4, 7, 11

Social Studies - Grade 5, 8, 11

Writing - Grade 5, 8, 12

Arts & Humanities - Grade 5, 8, 11

Practical Living/Vocational Studies - Grade 4, 7, 10

Writing Portfolio - Grade 4, 7, 12

Kentucky has alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for each content area assessment taken by the general population. Kentucky's alternate assessment program in 2006-07 was developed based on findings from a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) used to study content alignment to grade level academic standards. Kentucky studied the alignment of the previous grade span system to grade level standards, conducted a content alignment mapping, and began using the newly developed assessments in 2006-07.

The Alternate Assessment consists of alternate portfolios to measure reading, math and science, while attainment tasks and transition attainment records are designed to measure the other state requirement assessment components. The alternate assessment is designed for the approximately 1 percent of students that have disabilities that do not permit them to participate in the regular assessment, even with accommodations.

Kentucky set new alternate achievement standards aligned to grade-level achievement standards for the alternate assessment program in 2006-07. Since the alternate assessment was redesigned in 2006-07, no changes are planned for the reading, math and science components for 2007-08.

2007 Alternate Assessment:

Alternate Assessment - Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky implemented several changes to the statewide assessment and accountability program during 2006-2007 to achieve full compliance with the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. Students are now assessed annually with the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in reading and mathematics at grades 3-8 and once at high school and in science once at elementary, middle school and high school. Kentucky's Alternate Assessment Program implemented a portfolio process in reading, mathematics, and science that reports separate content area scores and links to grade-level content standards.

The Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) has four performance levels used to describe the quality of student work. The levels, from lowest to highest, are Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD). In addition, the first two levels of performance in reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing have each been subdivided into three levels (Novice non-performance, Novice medium, Novice high, Apprentice low, Apprentice medium and Apprentice high) to better represent student performance. Kentucky law states that all schools shall expect "a high level of achievement of all students". That high level, defined by the Kentucky Board of Education, is the Proficient level.

During the summer of 2007, Kentucky educators set student achievement standards for Kentucky's student performance levels (novice, apprentice, proficient and distinguished) for the reading and mathematics tests in new grades and validated standards for tests in existing grades, including science where testing had not changed. Achievement standards were also set for the Kentucky Alternate Assessment Portfolios in reading, mathematics and science. A total of over 300 Kentucky teachers and administrators participated in these processes.

The standard setting process was designed by Kentucky's assessment contractor and reviewed by the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability, NTAPAA. The new standards were approved by Kentucky's Commissioner of Education in August 2007 and fully implemented for 2006-07 reporting. Since the KCCT was fully redesigned for 2006-07, no changes are planned for the academic achievement standards for 2007-08.

Kentucky has developed test blueprints for the reading and mathematics Kentucky Core Content. These blueprints indicate the emphasis for the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment, expressed in percentage of items. During test development, each test item is mapped to a corresponding content area and grade level and to the appropriate sub-domain, section and bullet of Kentucky's Core Content for Assessment. State law KRS 156:6453 required the Kentucky Board of Education to ensure that Kentucky teachers had a significant role in the design of assessments. Eight to ten teachers (P-16) specializing in each grade and content area, along with a Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) content specialist, must come to consensus regarding how each assessment item maps onto Core Content. Kentucky uses a collaborative process to assure our assessment system provides coherent information.

Kentucky includes all students in the state assessment program. Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and 504 Plans participate in the state assessment with accommodations and modifications specific to their learning needs. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities participate in the Kentucky Alternate Assessment program. The Alternate Assessment consists of portfolios (reading, math and science), attainment tasks and transition attainment records designed for students with the disabilities that do not permit them to participate in the regular assessment, even with accommodations. The academic achievement standards for the alternate assessment are the same as the KCCT. The alternate has four performance levels used to describe the quality of student work. The levels, from lowest to highest, are Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD). In addition, the first two levels of performance in have each been subdivided into three levels (Novice non-performance, Novice medium, Novice high, Apprentice low, Apprentice medium and Apprentice high) to better represent student performance. Since the Alternate Assessment was redesigned for 2006-07, no changes are planned for the academic achievement standards for 2007-08.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's progress toward developing and implementing assessments in science were documented and included in 1.1.2. Below is the full description, including the science implementation.

Kentucky's 2006-07 implementation plan was based on the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in order to comply with the "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001" requirements to assess reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and once at the high school level and assess science once at each grade span. While Kentucky met NCLB requirements in 2005-06 with an Augmented NRT, the KCCT was redesigned for 2006-07. The redesign included new KCCT assessments in the previously augmented grades of 3,5,6,8 for reading and 3,4,6,7 for math. The redesign included continuing grade span assessment in science at grades 4, 7, 11. The redesign was completed with standard setting and validation process in the summer of 2007. Since the KCCT was redesigned in 2006-07, no changes are planned for 2007-08.

The Core Content for Assessment provided the focus for the development of the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in 2006-07. Each year Kentucky teachers on the Content Advisory Committees use the Core Content for Assessment to write the test items for the state assessment. Kentucky's assessment contractor refines items drafted by Kentucky teachers as needed to ensure that each item meets testing standards.

As the table shows below, science was assessed in each of the required grade ranges as well.

2007 Standards Based (KCCT):

Reading - Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10

Math - Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11

Science - Grade 4, 7, 11

Social Studies - Grade 5, 8, 11

Writing - Grade 5, 8, 12

Arts & Humanities - Grade 5, 8, 11

Practical Living/Vocational Studies - Grade 4, 7, 10

Writing Portfolio - Grade 4, 7, 12

Kentucky has alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for each content area assessment taken by the general population. Kentucky's alternate assessment program in 2006-07 was developed based on findings from a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) used to study content alignment to grade level academic standards. Kentucky studied the alignment of the previous grade span system to grade level standards, conducted a content alignment mapping, and began using the newly developed assessments in 2006-07.

The Alternate Assessment consists of alternate portfolios to measure reading, math and science, while attainment tasks and transition attainment records are designed to measure the other state requirement assessment components. The alternate assessment is designed for the approximately 1 percent of students that have disabilities that do not permit them to participate in the regular assessment, even with accommodations.

Kentucky set new alternate achievement standards aligned to grade-level achievement standards for the alternate assessment program in 2006-07. Since the alternate assessment was redesigned in 2006-07, no changes are planned for the reading, math and science components for 2007-08.

2007 Alternate Assessment:

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky's progress toward developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science were included in 1.1.3 and are also listed below.

Kentucky implemented several changes to the statewide assessment and accountability program during 2006-2007 to achieve full compliance with the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. Students are now assessed annually with the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) in reading and mathematics at grades 3-8 and once at high school and in science once at elementary, middle school and high school. Kentucky's Alternate Assessment Program implemented a portfolio process in reading, mathematics, and science that reports separate content area scores and links to grade-level content standards.

The Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) has four performance levels used to describe the quality of student work. The levels, from lowest to highest, are Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD). In addition, the first two levels of performance in reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing have each been subdivided into three levels (Novice non-performance, Novice medium, Novice high, Apprentice low, Apprentice medium and Apprentice high) to better represent student performance. Kentucky law states that all schools shall expect "a high level of achievement of all students". That high level, defined by the Kentucky Board of Education, is the Proficient level.

During the summer of 2007, Kentucky educators set student achievement standards for Kentucky's student performance levels (novice, apprentice, proficient and distinguished) for the reading and mathematics tests in new grades and validated standards for tests in existing grades, including science where testing had not changed. Achievement standards were also set for the Kentucky Alternate Assessment Portfolios in reading, mathematics and science. A total of over 300 Kentucky teachers and administrators participated in these processes.

The standard setting process was designed by Kentucky's assessment contractor and reviewed by the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability, NTAPAA. The new standards were approved by Kentucky's Commissioner of Education in August 2007 and fully implemented for 2006-07 reporting. Since the KCCT was fully redesigned for 2006-07, no changes are planned for the academic achievement standards for 2007-08.

Kentucky has developed test blueprints for the reading and mathematics Kentucky Core Content. These blueprints indicate the emphasis for the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment, expressed in percentage of items. During test development, each test item is mapped to a corresponding content area and grade level and to the appropriate sub-domain, section and bullet of Kentucky's Core Content for Assessment. State law KRS 156:6453 required the Kentucky Board of Education to ensure that Kentucky teachers had a significant role in the design of assessments. Eight to ten teachers (P-16) specializing in each grade and content area, along with a Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) content specialist, must come to consensus regarding how each assessment item maps onto Core Content. Kentucky uses a collaborative process to assure our assessment system provides coherent information.

Kentucky includes all students in the state assessment program. Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and 504 Plans participate in the state assessment with accommodations and modifications specific to their learning needs. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities participate in the Kentucky Alternate Assessment program. The Alternate Assessment consists of portfolios (reading, math and science), attainment tasks and transition attainment records designed for students with the disabilities that do not permit them to participate in the regular assessment, even with accommodations. The academic achievement standards for the alternate assessment are the same as the KCCT. The alternate has four performance levels used to describe the quality of student work. The levels, from lowest to highest, are Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD). In addition, the first two levels of performance in have each been subdivided into three levels (Novice non-performance, Novice medium, Novice high, Apprentice low, Apprentice medium and Apprentice high) to better represent student performance. Since the Alternate Assessment was redesigned for 2006-07, no changes are planned for the academic achievement standards for 2007-08.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	337829	337364	99.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	418	418	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3077	3076	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	33788	33786	100.0
Hispanic	7288	7285	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	287342	287332	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48579	48576	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5120	5112	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	170535	170524	100.0
Migratory students	1974	1974	100.0
Male	173304	173294	100.0
Female	164077	164070	100.0

Comments: Note: Mathematics is assessed at grades 3-8 and 11, and reading is assessed at grades 3-8 and 10. Therefore, the number of students enrolled and tested by content will not match because the mathematics and reading high school assessments are administered at different grades.

The counts above are representative of the data required for No Child Left Behind Act reporting for participation and not for accountability.

The percentage tested for mathematics in 2007 may vary from the 2006 percentage for student groups (including LEP) because accountability was based on the previous grade span assessments in 2006 (Wellstone Amendment), while testing was completed for grades 3-8 and 11 in 2007.

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	14956	30.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29961	61.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3652	7.5
Total	48569	
Comments: The total on the page is based on students tested under the state guidelines of inclusion as required by state regulation. The other students attempted the test but were not included in accountability.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	344102	343595	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	424	424	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3122	3121	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	34867	34864	100.0
Hispanic	7439	7436	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	292126	292118	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49863	49860	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5242	5235	99.9
Economically disadvantaged students	175730	175721	100.0
Migratory students	2024	2024	100.0
Male	176836	176824	100.0
Female	166774	166771	100.0

Comments: Note: Reading is assessed at grades 3-8 and 10, and mathematics is assessed at grade 3-8 and 11. Therefore, the number of students enrolled and tested by content will not match because the reading and mathematics high school assessments are administered at different grades.

The counts above are representative of the data required for No Child Left Behind Act reporting for participation and not for accountability.

The percentage tested for reading in 2007 may vary from the 2006 percentage for student groups (including LEP) because accountability was based on the previous grade span assessments in 2006 (Wellstone Amendment), while testing was completed for grades 3-8 and 10 in 2007.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15392	30.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30725	61.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3736	7.5
Total	49853	
Comments: The total on the page is based on students tested under the state guidelines of inclusion. The other students attempted the test but were not included in accountability.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48980	32281	65.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	37	66.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	459	376	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4930	2288	46.4
Hispanic	1289	759	58.9
White, non-Hispanic	41071	28150	68.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8716	3904	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	957	491	51.3
Economically disadvantaged students	26341	14675	55.7
Migratory students	277	153	55.2
Male	25057	16506	65.9
Female	23849	15746	66.0
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48980	36823	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	39	69.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	459	387	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4930	2809	57.0
Hispanic	1289	879	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	41071	31906	77.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8716	4908	56.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	957	566	59.1
Economically disadvantaged students	26341	17536	66.6
Migratory students	277	172	62.1
Male	25057	18372	73.3
Female	23849	18414	77.2
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48018	29019	60.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	23	46.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	445	365	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4877	2043	41.9
Hispanic	1138	572	50.3
White, non-Hispanic	40478	25475	62.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7947	2961	37.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	861	372	43.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25673	12718	49.5
Migratory students	302	147	48.7
Male	24734	14892	60.2
Female	23222	14108	60.8
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48018	34864	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	38	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	445	372	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4877	2653	54.4
Hispanic	1138	776	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	40478	30344	75.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7947	4248	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	861	504	58.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25673	16462	64.1
Migratory students	302	188	62.3
Male	24734	17117	69.2
Female	23222	17723	76.3
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48122	28247	58.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	34	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	416	333	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4925	2011	40.8
Hispanic	1096	559	51.0
White, non-Hispanic	40727	24844	61.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7493	2455	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	736	316	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	25693	12220	47.6
Migratory students	332	161	48.5
Male	24921	14265	57.2
Female	23144	13962	60.3
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48122	33839	70.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	35	59.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	416	339	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4925	2532	51.4
Hispanic	1096	677	61.8
White, non-Hispanic	40727	29688	72.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7493	3448	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	736	381	51.8
Economically disadvantaged students	25693	15582	60.6
Migratory students	332	197	59.3
Male	24921	16501	66.2
Female	23144	17310	74.8
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49022	27266	55.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	34	52.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	439	352	80.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5080	1832	36.1
Hispanic	1075	508	47.3
White, non-Hispanic	41519	24154	58.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6886	1668	24.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	634	212	33.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25270	11105	43.9
Migratory students	251	96	38.2
Male	25292	13598	53.8
Female	23663	13649	57.7
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49022	33513	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	44	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	439	346	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5080	2531	49.8
Hispanic	1075	606	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	41519	29461	71.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6886	2401	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	634	221	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	25270	14633	57.9
Migratory students	251	121	48.2
Male	25292	15776	62.4
Female	23663	17716	74.9
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49289	25196	51.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	68	29	42.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	422	318	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4996	1480	29.6
Hispanic	932	391	42.0
White, non-Hispanic	42115	22649	53.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6668	1351	20.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	488	143	29.3
Economically disadvantaged students	25213	9483	37.6
Migratory students	298	99	33.2
Male	25533	12586	49.3
Female	23702	12596	53.1
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49289	32715	66.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	68	40	58.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	422	348	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4996	2450	49.0
Hispanic	932	552	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	42115	28877	68.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6668	2060	30.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	488	191	39.1
Economically disadvantaged students	25213	13986	55.5
Migratory students	298	145	48.7
Male	25533	15118	59.2
Female	23702	17582	74.2
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50335	24608	48.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	30	42.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	391	294	75.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4992	1423	28.5
Hispanic	887	345	38.9
White, non-Hispanic	43261	22217	51.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6542	1163	17.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	476	147	30.9
Economically disadvantaged students	25211	9132	36.2
Migratory students	325	110	33.8
Male	25842	12463	48.2
Female	24424	12130	49.7
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	50335	32346	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	44	62.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	391	316	80.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4992	2416	48.4
Hispanic	887	465	52.4
White, non-Hispanic	43261	28697	66.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6542	1708	26.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	476	172	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	25211	13412	53.2
Migratory students	325	156	48.0
Male	25842	14536	56.2
Female	24424	17796	72.9
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43418	17062	39.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	16	32.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	366	253	69.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3924	822	20.9
Hispanic	629	188	29.9
White, non-Hispanic	38009	15634	41.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4317	345	8.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	365	88	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	16726	4107	24.6
Migratory students	171	42	24.6
Male	21573	8320	38.6
Female	21787	8732	40.1
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	49638	29857	60.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	35	62.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	408	304	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4999	2189	43.8
Hispanic	749	366	48.9
White, non-Hispanic	42780	26646	62.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5601	985	17.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	438	110	25.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21881	10395	47.5
Migratory students	221	93	42.1
Male	25072	12906	51.5
Female	24464	16933	69.2
Comments: Changes in proficiency numbers are due to a change in test structure. The differences in the counts are due to the population being small.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1180	920	78.0
Districts	175	92	52.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	846	698	82.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	773	631	81.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	73	67	91.8
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
173	123	71.1
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State Title I Consultants reviewed reports for schools identified for School Improvement Year 1 and Year 2 to ensure that funds were expended for professional development that would improve academic achievement of groups not making adequate yearly progress. The consultants provided technical assistance regarding revisions to school improvement plans that would have the greatest impact on improving teaching and learning. The consultants reviewed Corrective Action Plans and Restructuring Plans. District Achievement Gap Coordinators worked with districts that had schools identified for Corrective Action and Restructuring to ensure that the actions taken would impact achievement. Highly Skilled Educators worked with schools that failed to meet the state dimension of accountability.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	27
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	29
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	4
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	2
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State Title I Consultants reviewed the improvement plans for districts in corrective action for activities and goals that would improve student achievement with groups of students that did not make adequate yearly progress. Districts identified for corrective action received technical assistance through intervention models that included Voluntary Partnership Assistance Teams, State Assistance Teams, or Network Assistance Teams. The teams consisted of District Achievement Gap Coordinators, superintendent mentors, school board mentors, State Title I Consultants, and district administrators. The teams met on a regular basis to monitor progress toward goals set in the district improvement plan.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	44
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	09/12/07	09/12/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		
Comments: Preliminary school AYP and identification does not apply in Kentucky.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	36	36
Schools	13	13
Comments: The large number of districts was due to a change in the test administration policy in order to be compliant with NCLB.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	12/04/07
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Kentucky Department of Education gave priority to schools identified for corrective action or restructuring. Allocations to districts with identified schools were formula based. The following bases were used for allocations to schools: \$12,500 for Year 1 Improvement; \$20,000 for Year 2 Improvement; \$25,000 for Corrective Action; \$30,000 for Restructuring. Additional funds were allocated based on the number of low-income students in the school. The funds were used for supplemental educational services; transportation for school choice; strategies to eliminate achievement gaps between groups of students; and comprehensive school reform models.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	68
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	63
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	89722
Who applied to transfer	1423
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	801

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 644732
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	38
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	67
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	36005
Who applied for supplemental educational services	3063
Who received supplemental educational services	3063
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3664640
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	182144	178563	98.0	3581	2.0
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	17380	17182	98.9	198	1.1
Low-poverty schools	22094	21968	99.4	126	0.6
All elementary schools	77719	77025	99.1	694	0.9
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	23340	22574	96.7	766	3.3
Low-poverty schools	29744	29023	97.6	721	2.4
All secondary schools	104425	101538	97.2	2887	2.8
Comments:					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state allows districts to opt for either at their discretion.

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	70.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	30.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	62.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	76.1	47.7
Poverty metric used	This was based upon the percentage of the student population that qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.	
Secondary schools	55.4	32.4
Poverty metric used	This was based upon the percentage of the student population that qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.	
Comments: In reality the poverty metric for secondary schools varies by school type. Middle schools use 39.16% as the cutoff for low poverty and 62.85% for high poverty. High schools use 32.37% for low poverty and 55.35% for high poverty.		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
0	Dual language	0	0.0	0.0
0	Two-way immersion	0	0.0	0.0
0	Transitional bilingual	0	0.0	0.0
0	Developmental bilingual	0	0.0	0.0
0	Heritage language	0	0.0	0.0
10	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
21	Content-based ESL			
33	Pull-out ESL			
33	Other (explain)			

Comments: Another type of Title III and language instructional program in the state is Immersion.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	10060
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	7050
Japanese	446
Bosnian	357
Vietnamese	332
French	276

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Other significant languages include Chinese Mandarin (222), Arabic (215), Somali (166), Mai Mai (150), Russian (136), Korean (122), Turkish (113), Albanian (102), and Serbo-Croatian (100).

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	10816
Not tested/State annual ELP	30
Subtotal	10846
LEP/One Data Point	3882
Comments: For the 2006-07 year, the State allowed LEP students with severe cognitive disabilities that qualify for Kentucky's 1% alternate assessment to be exempted from the English language proficiency (ELP) assessment. This was permitted since no appropriate alternate ELP assessment was available for this student population. The WIDA Consortium is currently piloting the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs. As a member of the consortium, Kentucky will examine the WIDA produced Alternate ELP assessment.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	10030
Not tested/State annual ELP	30
Subtotal	10060
LEP/One Data Point	3402
Comments: For the 2006-07 year, the State allowed LEP students with severe cognitive disabilities that qualify for Kentucky's 1% alternate assessment to be exempted from the English language proficiency (ELP) assessment. This was permitted since no appropriate alternate ELP assessment was available for this student population. The WIDA Consortium is currently piloting the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs. As a member of the consortium, Kentucky will examine the WIDA-produced alternate ELP assessment.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	59.0	4998	46.0	N
No progress		5162		
ELP attainment	8.0	656	6.0	N
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	59.0	4780	48.0	N
No progress		4638		
ELP attainment	6.0	612	6.0	Y
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	1249
MFLEP/AYP grades	1002
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	4256
LEP HS/Non-AYP	1840
LEP other grades	25
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
0	0	0.0
Comments: The state does not provide a native language version of the state NCLB mathematics assessment.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
0	0	0.0
Comments: The state does not provide a native language version of the state NCLB reading/language arts assessment.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1132	117	1249
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1249	768	61.5	481

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: In Table 1.6.3.6.2, the total number tested is not near or equal to the total in Table 1.6.3.4.3, row 2(1002), because the state computes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for grades 3-8 and 11. Therefore, numbers for the other grades were removed resulting in the difference between the totals.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1246	905	72.6	341

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: In Table 1.6.3.6.3, the total number tested (1246) is not near or equal to Table 1.6.3.4.3, row 2 (1002), because the state computes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for grades 3-8 and 10. Therefore, numbers for the other grades were removed resulting in the difference between the totals.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	33
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	15
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	16
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	16
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
4075	3231	18

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	3973
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	247
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	251

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

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	29	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	25	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	19	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	11	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	21	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	26	2850
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	21	721
PD provided to principals	24	208
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	24	162
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	18	652
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	5	112
Total		4705
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/06	10/1/06	90
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

A new collection process and timeline for reporting Limited English Proficient (LEP) and Immigrant students implemented in 2006-07 provide the necessary data to the State's Division of Budgets to be used in the formula to identify tentative "eligible entities." As a result, data collection is now available by July 1 instead of September 1. Kentucky LEAs receive final award notification 6 to 8 weeks sooner than in previous grant years, thereby shortening the number of days needed to make funds available to subgrantees.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	83.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Data on sub-populations is not available.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5.5
Hispanic	6.1
White, non-Hispanic	3.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.9
Female	2.7
Comments: Certain sub-populations are not currently collected.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	155	155
LEAs with subgrants	19	19
Total	174	174
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	496	261
K	1169	1011
1	1149	621
2	1163	640
3	1115	521
4	892	443
5	853	520
6	707	553
7	643	516
8	531	525
9	694	438
10	634	385
11	532	408
12	495	422
Ungraded	0	0
Total	11073	7264
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	172	168
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	10721	6914
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	93	97
Hotels/Motels	87	85
Total	11073	7264
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	496
K	1169
1	1149
2	1163
3	1115
4	892
5	853
6	707
7	643
8	531
9	694
10	634
11	532
12	495
Ungraded	0
Total	11073

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	69
Migratory children/youth	127
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	829
Limit English proficient students	142

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	19
2. Expedited evaluations	19
3. Staff professional development and awareness	19
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
5. Transportation	19
6. Early childhood programs	19
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	19
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	19
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	19
12. Counseling	19
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	19
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
15. School supplies	19
16. Referral to other programs and services	19
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	19
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	19
2. School Selection	19
3. Transportation	19
4. School records	19
5. Immunizations	19
6. Other medical records	19
7. Other Barriers	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	484	104
4	577	192
5	569	132
6	439	112
7	511	157
8	474	120
High School	817	163
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	484	78
4	577	106
5	569	195
6	439	65
7	511	138
8	474	116
High School	817	194
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	438
K	285
1	295
2	277
3	243
4	245
5	262
6	210
7	195
8	199
9	199
10	134
11	86
12	65
Ungraded	106
Out-of-school	869
Total	4108
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky is again experiencing a significant decrease in student numbers for Category 1.

Movement into Kentucky and from school district to school district reflects workers looking for factory work, construction work and other types of work including jobs in the horse industry. Kentucky is home to thoroughbred, saddlebred and harness horses and there are several race tracks throughout the state. Tobacco and hay crops are grown on farms, in addition to raising of the horses mentioned above, and workers eventually perform jobs related to these seasonal crops. However, the original intent was to work with horses or at the race tracks.

The majority of the population moving into Kentucky school districts are looking for and obtaining permanent, non-qualifying work. The intent to seek qualifying work is not evident. Workers are here and doing qualifying work but did not move to Kentucky with the intent to find qualifying work.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	178
K	107
1	134
2	119
3	118
4	123
5	91
6	84
7	74
8	71
9	72
10	45
11	29
12	27
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	59
Total	1348
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky has again seen a continuous significant decline in migrant children being severed for Category 2. Many more programs are being offered by other agencies (i.e., Salvation Army Camp, 4-H Camp) and the children want to be involved in these. Most of these overlap during the summer months. A large portion of students who are emancipated work 15 hour days/seven days a week during tobacco cutting times.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The system Kentucky used to compile and generate its 2006-2007 Category 1 and Category 2 child count was MIS2000. The 2005-2006 Category 1 and Category 2 child count also used MIS2000.
--

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data included all student information: e.g., child's name, sex, birth date, race, birthplace, parent names, student number and the COE number.

Data collected for eligibility information were the QAD (month/day/year), residency date (month/day/year), withdrawal date (month/day/year), termination date (month/day/year). These were calculated by MIS2000 with qualifying activity and comments provided, if needed.

School information data included the enrollment date (month day year) withdrawal date (month day year) enrollment type (S for summer school I for inter-session; if regular school the information was null) and attendance data was provided for all children enrolled in school (summer inter-session and regular)

Additional data collected were Supplemental Programs. The Supplemental Programs are broken down into 2 categories. The first category is Supplemental Instruction: Reading Instruction Math Instruction and Other Instruction (the remaining content areas). The second category is Supportive Service: Support Service and Referral.

The Priority for Service Students were broken down into 2 categories. The first category was Education Interruption enrolled in 2 or more schools during the school year enrolled late in school and withdrew early from school. The second category was Academically At-Risk: scored novice in Kentucky's KCCT math or reading assessment scored below level in 1 or more areas of the LEP assessment (ACCESS) received a grade of D or F in math reading or remaining core content areas in grades 4 through 12 and an area of concern by the classroom teacher was indicated in math reading or remaining core content areas for grades K through 3.

Recruiters use a Basic Interview Pattern (BIP) and a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) to collect student data on students determined eligible. Once these two forms are completed signed and reviewed again the forms are sent to the regional clerk for further review. Once they are determined eligible at the regional level the data is entered into MIS2000.

Nine regional records clerks entered data for the 2007 fiscal year all during the year. The data entered from the COE has been described above. A Kentucky Migrant Student Withdrawal form is used to withdraw each student. This form is used when a child moves out of the school district and/or at the end of the school year. The information on the withdrawal form includes the district name the student's name withdrawal date and attendance data Supplemental Programs and Secondary Credit information for grades 9-12. A time line is provided to clerks showing the deadline for this regular school information is July 31. For students participating in summer/inter-session projects their data is also entered into the MIS2000 system using a Summer School/Inter-session form. The information included the child's name school name withdrawal date attendance data Supplemental Instruction and Supportive Service. This information is entered at the conclusion of the summer/inter-session project. The time line shows a deadline for entering this information as 8/31.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information from the COE is entered into MIS2000 at the regional level by nine regional clerks. Once the student COE is determined to be eligible, the information is entered. At the conclusion of each day, an upload process is run. Each student is withdrawn on a Kentucky Migrant Student Withdrawal form. This is used when a child moves out of the school district and/or at the end of the school year. The information includes district name, student's name, withdrawal date and attendance data, and Supplemental Programs and Secondary Credit for grades 9-12. For students participating in summer/inter-session projects, their data is entered into MIS2000 using a Summer School/Inter-session form. The same data is entered as mentioned for the regular school year. Inter-session information is provided during the regular school year and the summer school information has a deadline for entry into MIS2000 of 8/31.

The inclusion of the Supplemental Instruction and the Supportive Service information is supplied for the purpose of a child count at the state level. Supplemental Instruction includes Reading Instruction, Math Instruction, and Other Instruction. Supportive Service includes Counseling Service, Support Service, and Referral. It is shown on the form if services were rendered during the regular school year, summer school, or inter-session.

In order to provide updated information for child count purposes a timeline has been established for clerks. During the months of August and September, enrollment information for the regular school year is due at the clerk's office two weeks after the beginning of school. Continued Residency Verification Signatures must be signed by August 31 and were due in the state office by September 7, 2007.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Students for Category 2 were identified by the MIS2000 system using a query to filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. The dates of 5/15/07 through 8/31/07 were identified for summer school/intersession. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicated enrollment in summer school or inter-session. MIS2000 was filtered to pick up either "S" or "I" but not both for funding purposes.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky generated its reports using MIS2000 running queries that filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. Using the dates of 9/1/06 through 8/31/07, MIS2000 developed a report for Kentucky determining the number of students. These reports looked at the QAD being within 36 months of the start date. The termination withdrawal residency QAD and enrollment dates fall between the start and end dates within these reports. MIS2000 calculated these students within the start and end date for the school year.

Students for category 2 were identified by the MIS2000 system using a query to filter out any child who did not meet certain criteria during the child count period. The dates of 5/15/07 through 8/31/07 were for summer school/inter-session. The placement of "S" or "I" in enrollment type indicated enrollment in summer school or inter-session. MIS2000 was filtered to pick up either "S" or "I" but not both for funding purposes.

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

The COEs used in Kentucky have an original COE with triplicate copies attached. The original is removed and filed in the regional migrant office. The remaining three copies are maintained in each district migrant office. If the family still resides within the district during the remaining two years of eligibility, a parent signature is obtained one time during each funding year and forwarded to the state office. During the FY07 funding period, due to funding cuts for travel expenses and high gas prices after an initial visit to a migrant family's home, the local MEP personnel could obtain a signature from someone who had physically seen each student listed on the COE. This person's signature would include a comment as to the location and the date each child was last physically seen. If three signatures are obtained (during the 36 months for eligibility), the fourth copy of the COE is returned to the regional migrant office showing all the required signatures that indicate residence within the school district. The student names from the COEs along with the parent signatures are matched with an unduplicated list of students used for the child count to validate residence within Kentucky.

In the case of Category 2, using a MIS2000 report, the summer/intersession count is generated by using 5/15/07 -8/31/07 as the start and end dates indicating a child has at least attended one day of summer school or intersession. The report asks that the QAD be within three years of the start date; the 3rd birthday is less than the end date; the 22nd birth date is greater than the end date; the termination funding withdrawal residency and QAD dates are between the start and ending dates; the 22nd birthday is greater than the funding date; the 3rd birthday is less than the withdrawal date. As a result, the report is designed to locate all children whose eligibility ended before the start dates of summer or intersession services and these are not included in category 2. Summer school is indicated by "S" being placed in the enrollment type and intersession is indicated by "I" being placed in the enrollment type. These students are recipients of MEP-funded services.

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

by verifying the birthdate, birthplace, parent's name or the latest school attended.

Once the student is in the MIS2000 system, an on-going procedure is used to ensure that duplicate records are identified and eliminated. Each records clerk will run a "Potential Duplicate Students" report once a month. The Potential Duplicate Students report looks at matching date of birth, close dates of birth, date of birth plus last or first name matching date of birth, first name potentially adopted duplicates, the same student number and a soundex match (first and/or last names that sound the same). If the clerk finds duplicate students, an e-mail is sent to the state consultant for records clerks. The clerk asks the state consultant to merge the two numbers due to finding duplicate numbers for one student. The student number to be kept is identified and the number to be merged is identified. The state consultant runs the same report as mentioned above once a month. If the state consultant cannot determine which student number to retain, the local migrant projects are consulted and the determination is made there. Once the student with the originally assigned number is determined, the state consultant will merge the numbers. Kentucky is confident that unique identification numbers are assigned for each child. The MIS2000 child counts can determine from selected factors, such as birthplace parent names, birthplace and student name, and the child will be counted one time for funding purposes. Both the regional records clerks and the state consultant run reports monthly to check for duplication.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To ensure proper verifications of eligibility, Kentucky begins with a standard COE used by all MEP projects. All eligibility determinations are made based upon a personal interview with a parent, guardian, or out-of-school youth. State personnel conduct annual training sessions for all recruiters. Training includes basic eligibility definitions, PMOL, temporary vs seasonal processing, industrial surveys, employment surveys, interviewing techniques (desirable vs. undesirable) timelines for crops and mock interviews. All COEs are reviewed by the records clerk for missing or incomplete information and corrected prior to being given to the regional coordinator for review and signature. Copies of COEs are then sent to the state consultant in charge of recruitment and records where these are reviewed. Any questions regarding the COEs are clarified by discussions with recruiters. If questions cannot be answered to the satisfaction of the state consultant, recruiters are asked to provide additional information or clarification, re-interview the family or the state consultant tells the family that it does not qualify. The state provides a handbook for recruitment as well as a handbook for training new recruiters. Training on the handbook has been provided to all recruiters either in state and regional sessions and/or on a one-to-one basis. SEA staff randomly check eligibility decisions of recruiters during monitoring visits to local and regional projects through both reviews of original COEs and telephone or face-to-face contacts with families. Regional MEP Coordinators also review random samples of eligibility decisions through telephone or face-to-face interviews with families. The state consultant randomly selects children who have been reported as attending summer/intersession programs to see if attendance and service codes are being recorded. State migrant consultants observe the instructional content of projects and verify student participation by randomly visiting summer projects.

Kentucky has a process for resolving complaints or issues of any type. This is found in Kentucky Administrative Regulation 704 KAR 3:365 and also in Kentucky's Quality Control Process. This process begins at the regional level. The coordinators must: review the nature of the question or complaint; contact the person raising the question or complaint regarding eligibility; discuss the situation with the recruiter; meet with the family to determine if the eligibility decision was correct; take any necessary corrective action; and notify the state MEP office if the issue cannot be resolved at the local level. Questions or disputes submitted to the state MEP office will be handled in the following manner: the questioner or complainant will be contacted by telephone or in person to gather information about the issue; the appropriate LEA project and school officials will be informed that a question or dispute has been filed with the state office; state staff will meet with the project and school officials to discuss the issue; a preliminary investigation will be conducted to see if there is evidence that the complaint may have validity; further investigation will be conducted if it appears that the complaint has validity based upon preliminary investigation; the LEA project and school officials will be informed in writing of the steps that must be taken for corrective action and for any sanctions; any misidentified children will be removed from MIS2000; refunding of MEP funds from the LEA will be discussed; training and other positive steps will be initiated to ensure the problem will not reoccur; written feedback will be provided to the complainant as to what was found and how the situation has been handled.

Effectiveness of recruitment efforts is evaluated during monitoring visits through training sessions with recruiters and through a review of a copy of each COE that is submitted to the state ID&R consultant. Local recruiters complete a District Recruitment Plan and submit this to the state contact for recruiters. This allows the state office to make decisions about needed areas of re-emphasis in the training of recruiters and any revisions that might need to be made to the recruiter handbook or to the handbook for new recruiters. Guidance is annually sent out to regional records clerks concerning collecting and reporting pupil and attendance data. Annual training is provided to regional records clerks. Additional trainings will be held at regional settings on a one-to-one basis and during monitoring visits concerning all phases of keeping records, inputting data and running reports associated with MIS2000. In addition to the SEA receiving the most recent COE, Kentucky has developed its COE in a triplicate copy format. Between 9/1 and 8/31 of each funding year, a signature is obtained to verify that each child listed on the original COE still resides within the school district. A signature from the parent is the preferred signature; however, the advocate or recruiter may sign the form as well as another employee of the school district. These employees could be a classroom teacher, school principal, etc. If anyone other than the parent signs the Continued Residency Verification form, a comment must be given in the comment section providing the date and location the LEA employee last physically saw the student. Each student must be addressed on this form. This date must be within the funding period of 9/1 through 8/31. For emancipated youth, the preferred signature is the youth themselves. However, an employer's signature is acceptable along with a comment stating when and where the emancipated youth was last physically seen.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky hired an outside re-interviewer to conduct interviews of migrant students. This person was a former ID&R coordinator in another state. The interviews took place over a period of 14 days. Using a report designed on MIS2000, 156 students were selected randomly from five districts. These districts were scattered across the entire state - two in western Kentucky, one in central Kentucky and two in eastern Kentucky. From the list of 156 students the state ID&R consultant checked the state database to see if the students currently reside in the state. Of the 156 students, 102 records showed the students as active and residing in their respective districts. Therefore, the outside reviewer faced 102 potential interviews. Upon arrival at the five districts, the list was shared with the MEP staff and after review by the staff in each district, it was determined that only 41 of the students still remained in the state. The ID&R consultant stressed how important it is that withdrawals are submitted to the regional offices within five days of learning of a move out of the district.

In four of the five districts receiving re-interviews, the interviewer was accompanied by the current recruiter for the district. The recruiters introduced the interviewer to the family members, but did not remain in the home for the re-interview. In one district, a neighboring district accompanied the re-interviewer to the address of the families, but the interviewer made her own introductions.

The Kentucky Child Eligibility Re-interview Form was used for all interviews. All 156 children randomly selected were assigned an interview number. The interview form showed the number assigned to each student and their COE number assigned by MIS2000. Other data included: student name, qualifying arrival date, district, date of interview, interviewer, person interviewed, relationship to student, and language used in the interview. If needed, information was given about moving, giving the approximate date moved, if known, and if the parent declined the interview. There were no interviews declined.

Questions asked on the form were: When did you move; Give me the reason for your move; Were you looking for work - If yes, what kind of work; Where did you live before you moved here; How long did you live there - Why did you move there - What kind of work did you do; Where did you live before this - Why did you move - What kind of work did you do; Back to the latest move, was the student identified above part of the move; Did you find work - If yes, what work did you find - Are you still doing this work - If work was not found, why - When did you begin to look for work; Do you or anyone else in the home have other income - If yes, where - When did you begin this work or begin receiving this income; Did the farm work play an important part in providing a living for your family? Responses to the questions can be provided, if needed. A signature of the person being interviewed is required. The Reviewer makes a determination if the student is eligible or not eligible. The signature of the interviewer is required.

Of the 41 actual interviews of students, 36 qualified and 5 did not qualify.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Quarterly, the state consultant provides LEAs with student lists to be checked for accuracy. Any changes to be made are made at the regional records clerk level. The clerk is to alert the state consultant about any changes.

Periodically, the state consultant will randomly select COEs to be audited. The consultant calls on recruiters and the families from the COEs.

Monthly the state consultant uses MIS2000 reports to seek out missing enrollments, withdrawals, birthdates, grade levels, QAD and Residency dates, race and sex codes, and facility names and IDs. The clerk is contacted by e-mail for corrections. A file is kept on needed corrections and updated when the corrections are made.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count information is reviewed by the State Director in consultation with the consultant for records/recruitment to make sure that the process of determining that students are unduplicated is accurate in both category 1 and 2. Printouts of counts are double checked to ensure that there is no duplication and that totals are accurate. The printout of every Kentucky student is matched with

another printout for students with a new COE during the current funding year or the Continued Residency Verification signatures. This process was explained above.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Kentucky will be divided into 4 regions beginning July 2008. The regional offices will be a direct arm of the Kentucky Department of Education Migrant Office. A new State ID&R Plan will be in place, as well as Regional ID&R Plans, District ID&R Plans and individual recruiter ID&R Plans. The regional coordinators will be trained yearly on reviewing COE, using a COE checklist. Regional coordinators will be required to conduct re-interviews within their own regional districts, and will be assigned to conduct re-interviews in other regions within the state. Recruiters will receive more training at the regional level. As new recruiters are hired during the year, two-day trainings will be offered throughout the year, rather than just at the beginning of the year.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.