

**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 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007

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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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 Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 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: 07/31/2007

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

 Part I, 2005-2006 Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Kentucky Department of Education

Address:
1st Floor, Capital Plaza Tower, 500 Mero St.
Frankfort, KY 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): Kevin M. Noland

Signature_____
Monday, February 26, 2007, 11:28:45 AM

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

Kentucky's Core Content for Assessment identifies content determined 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 in reading/language arts, mathematics, science and social studies 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 the 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 with 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.

The Core Content for Assessment 3.0 (CCA 3.0), adopted by the Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) in 1999, 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 on the spring 2006 state assessment in all content areas including reading, mathematics, and science at school-level grade-spans. Below are the grades assessed in spring 2006.

2006 Standards Based (KCCT):

Reading - Grade 4,7,10

Math - Grade 5,8,11

Science - Grade 4, 7, 11

Social Studies - Grade 5, 8, 11

Writing - Grade 4, 7, 12

Arts & Humanities - Grade 5, 8, 11

Practical Living/Vocational Studies - Grade 5, 8, 10

Writing Portfolio - Grade 4, 7, 12

Alternate Portfolio - Grade 4, 8, 12

2006 Augmented NRT (CTBS/5):

Reading - Grade 3,5,6,8

Math - Grade 3,4,6,7

The Core Content for Assessment 4.1 (CCA 4.1), released in August 2006, represents the content standards that will be assessed on the spring 2007 state assessment in all content areas including reading, mathematics, and science.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

The Core Content for Assessment provided the focus for the development of the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) and for the augmented NRT items used in 2006. 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. Kentucky's 2006 implementation plan included the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) and an Augmented NRT (CTBS/5) to comply with the "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001" requirements to assess reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 by school year 2005-2006. As the table shows below, science was assessed in each of the required grade ranges, and content standards and performance descriptors already exist.

2006 Standards Based (KCCT):

Reading - Grade 4,7,10

Math - Grade 5,8,11

Science - Grade 4, 7, 11

Social Studies - Grade 5, 8, 11

Writing - Grade 4, 7, 12

Arts & Humanities - Grade 5, 8, 11

Practical Living/Vocational Studies - Grade 5, 8, 10

Writing Portfolio - Grade 4, 7, 12

Alternate Portfolio - Grade 4, 8, 12

2006 Augmented NRT (CTBS/5):

Reading - Grade 3,5,6,8

Math - Grade 3,4,6,7

For 2007, the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) will be administered to those grades that were assessed with the Augmented NRT in 2006. While KCCT assessments from 2006 will continue, the new KCCT assessments will require new standards to be set. As the table shows below, science continues to be assessed in each of the required grade ranges, and content standards and performance descriptors already exist.

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

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

Kentucky has alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in reading, mathematics, science, social studies, practical living, and vocational studies for grades 4, 8, and 12. The alternate academic achievement standards set in the rubric in the summer of 1997 were written to reflect student performance levels on core content. Assessment evidence is required to document that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are working within age appropriate activities designed to provide meaningful access to the general curriculum designed to work toward standards through the use of adapted materials. The evidence of such activities and materials allows for students to show their progression through increasingly complex, hierarchical grade levels. The Kentucky Board of Education adopted academic achievement standards in June 2001, which include the same four levels of achievement as the Standards Based Assessment for general education: Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished.

Kentucky's alternate assessment program in 2006-07 has been developed based on findings from a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) used to study content alignment to grade level academic standards. Kentucky has studied the alignment of the previous grade span system to grade level standards, conducted a content alignment mapping, and began using the newly developed assessment strategies. Kentucky's new alternate assessment program, including a new standard setting process, will be completed in 2006-07.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

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 and social studies 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.

The KCCT standard setting process involved approximately 1600 Kentucky teachers. All together, three different methods were used to determine the most appropriate performance standards in each content area. This broad, collaborative advisory process involved teachers from every part of the state. The process itself was designed and overseen by the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability, NTAPAA. The purpose was to produce a set of clear, consistent, agreed-upon recommendations for standards establishing high expectations for student achievement. On June 5, 2001, the Kentucky Board of Education adopted standards for CATS. The new standards were fully implemented in 2002. Below are the grades and subjects assessed using these achievement standards.

2006 Standards Based (KCCT):

Reading - Grade 4,7,10

Math - Grade 5,8,11

Science - Grade 4, 7, 11

Social Studies - Grade 5, 8, 11

Writing - Grade 4, 7, 12

Arts & Humanities - Grade 5, 8, 11

Practical Living/Vocational Studies - Grade 5, 8, 10

Writing Portfolio - Grade 4, 7, 12

Alternate Portfolio - Grade 4, 8, 12

The standard setting for expanded reading and mathematics tests (Augmented NRT) administered in 2006 was conducted in the summer of 2006. Performance level descriptions for the four performance levels - Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished (NAPD) were drafted, and the cut scores for new grade levels were interpolated from existing cut scores from existing reading and math KCCT grades. The Kentucky Department of Education and its contractor worked in collaboration to develop preliminary NAPD performance level descriptions, use field-test data to interpolate and extrapolate cut scores in the new grade levels, and select an interpolation/extrapolation procedure. Committees of Kentucky educators were convened to study the cut scores in each grade level using a modification of the Bookmark Standard Setting Procedure and recommended changes as necessary to finalize cut scores and performance level descriptions. Below are the grades and subjects assessed using these achievement standards.

2006 Augmented NRT (CTBS/5):

Reading - Grade 3,5,6,8

Math - Grade 3,4,6,7

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 effort to assure our assessment system provides coherent information.

The Kentucky Alternate Assessment consists of portfolios and attainment tasks, designed for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, whose disabilities do not permit them to participate in the regular assessment, even with accommodations. Kentucky includes students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and 504 Plans in its state assessment. Students participate with modifications and accommodations specific to learning needs. Kentucky will revisit academic achievement standards during a standards setting procedure for the new 2007 assessment. See Section 1.1.2 above for additional information on Kentucky's Alternate Assessment Standards.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include 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.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	334585	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	2963	94.30
Black, non-Hispanic	35509	99.50
Hispanic	6497	94.90
White, non-Hispanic	284068	99.70
Students with Disabilities	40393	99.60
Limited English Proficient	3625	86.50
Economically Disadvantaged	165014	99.60
Migrant	1714	97.40
Male	172313	99.50
Female	162101	99.50

Comments: For the state assessment, the American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	340920	99.60
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	2955	95.10
Black, non-Hispanic	36271	99.50
Hispanic	6698	95.00
White, non-Hispanic	289368	99.70
Students with Disabilities	41199	99.60
Limited English Proficient	3698	86.40
Economically Disadvantaged	169302	99.60
Migrant	1805	97.40
Male	175761	99.50
Female	164983	99.60

Comments: For the state assessment, the American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include 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.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	39006	96.14
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1387	3.42
Comments: Kentucky does not currently administer alternate assessments aligned to grade-level standards, only alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards.		

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	39812	96.19
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1387	3.35
Comments: Kentucky does not currently administer alternate assessments aligned to grade-level standards, only alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	47623	53.30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	441	75.10
Black, non-Hispanic	5037	31.40
Hispanic	1154	38.00
White, non-Hispanic	39939	56.40
Students with Disabilities	6189	28.10
Limited English Proficient	784	31.80
Economically Disadvantaged	25167	41.30
Migrant	326	37.10
Male	24566	53.80
Female	23031	52.80

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in mathematics to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	47623	69.40
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	441	78.70
Black, non-Hispanic	5037	45.80
Hispanic	1154	57.60
White, non-Hispanic	39939	72.80
Students with Disabilities	6189	49.70
Limited English Proficient	784	50.30
Economically Disadvantaged	25167	59.30
Migrant	326	57.40
Male	24566	67.00
Female	23031	72.10

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8 in reading to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	47198	44.90
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	434	67.50
Black, non-Hispanic	4983	24.50
Hispanic	1037	31.40
White, non-Hispanic	39839	47.70
Students with Disabilities	6118	23.00
Limited English Proficient	639	28.20
Economically Disadvantaged	24906	32.40
Migrant	338	28.70
Male	24405	45.70
Female	22775	44.00

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in mathematics to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	47688	69.70
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	437	79.20
Black, non-Hispanic	5046	50.90
Hispanic	1043	60.30
White, non-Hispanic	40250	72.30
Students with Disabilities	6608	52.70
Limited English Proficient	641	53.70
Economically Disadvantaged	25226	60.30
Migrant	338	59.50
Male	24742	65.50
Female	22928	74.20

Comments: There were shifts in the number of students tested of these sub-populations from 2004-2005 school year. The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	48438	56.70
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	434	78.60
Black, non-Hispanic	5242	38.80
Hispanic	1041	49.60
White, non-Hispanic	40877	59.00
Students with Disabilities	6528	35.50
Limited English Proficient	583	43.40
Economically Disadvantaged	24940	45.50
Migrant	263	42.20
Male	24998	56.10
Female	23425	57.40

Comments: There were shifts in the total number of students and percent of students at proficient or above for certain sub-populations. The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	47948	70.20
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	431	79.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5179	48.60
Hispanic	1035	62.30
White, non-Hispanic	40466	73.10
Students with Disabilities	6038	47.90
Limited English Proficient	581	47.00
Economically Disadvantaged	24620	60.00
Migrant	263	57.00
Male	24661	67.90
Female	23272	72.60

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8 in reading to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	48638	42.90
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	430	72.60
Black, non-Hispanic	5199	21.90
Hispanic	917	31.20
White, non-Hispanic	41282	45.60
Students with Disabilities	5659	11.20
Limited English Proficient	436	19.50
Economically Disadvantaged	24569	29.90
Migrant	254	20.10
Male	25230	42.30
Female	23383	43.60

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in mathematics to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exits for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	48638	63.30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	430	75.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5199	40.10
Hispanic	917	50.80
White, non-Hispanic	41282	66.50
Students with Disabilities	5659	28.50
Limited English Proficient	436	27.10
Economically Disadvantaged	24569	51.50
Migrant	254	34.70
Male	25230	58.10
Female	23383	68.90

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8 in reading to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exits for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	49709	40.30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	388	71.10
Black, non-Hispanic	5290	21.90
Hispanic	881	27.10
White, non-Hispanic	42361	42.80
Students with Disabilities	5702	11.20
Limited English Proficient	445	19.80
Economically Disadvantaged	24868	26.90
Migrant	267	22.90
Male	25575	39.40
Female	24096	41.30

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in mathematics to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	50205	63.10
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	390	75.60
Black, non-Hispanic	5354	44.70
Hispanic	890	51.50
White, non-Hispanic	42777	65.60
Students with Disabilities	6198	31.20
Limited English Proficient	446	33.20
Economically Disadvantaged	25221	52.10
Migrant	270	43.70
Male	25892	55.70
Female	24275	71.00

Comments: There were shifts in the total number of students and percent of students at proficient or above for certain sub-populations. The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	50843	34.30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	442	67.20
Black, non-Hispanic	5593	14.90
Hispanic	924	24.70
White, non-Hispanic	43222	36.70
Students with Disabilities	6081	14.10
Limited English Proficient	464	16.80
Economically Disadvantaged	24963	21.80
Migrant	199	11.60
Male	26413	33.80
Female	24406	34.80

Comments: There were shifts in the total number of students and percent of students at proficient or above for certain sub-populations. The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	50347	58.90
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	440	74.30
Black, non-Hispanic	5529	36.80
Hispanic	915	44.50
White, non-Hispanic	42806	62.00
Students with Disabilities	5585	19.50
Limited English Proficient	463	20.70
Economically Disadvantaged	24610	45.30
Migrant	196	32.70
Male	26096	52.70
Female	24227	65.60

Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other". Alternate Assessment students are not included in Augmented NRT results. Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8 in reading to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	42136	38.50
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	394	64.50
Black, non-Hispanic	4165	18.10
Hispanic	543	28.40
White, non-Hispanic	36548	40.80
Students with Disabilities	4116	12.30
Limited English Proficient	274	20.80
Economically Disadvantaged	15601	24.00
Migrant	67	14.90
Male	21126	37.50
Female	20985	39.50

Comments: There were shifts in the total number of students and percent of students at proficient or above for certain sub-populations. The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	48471	40.40
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander	386	57.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4927	23.80
Hispanic	744	28.60
White, non-Hispanic	41848	42.60
Students with Disabilities	4922	10.60
Limited English Proficient	347	9.80
Economically Disadvantaged	19889	26.80
Migrant	158	15.20
Male	24574	31.90
Female	23867	49.30

Comments: There were shifts in the total number of students and percent of students at proficient or above for certain sub-populations. The American Indian/Alaska Native subpopulation is reported as "other".

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1164	771	66.20

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	176	78	44.30

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	825	609	73.80

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	173	76	43.90

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) provides on-going technical assistance to districts with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring through guidance documents, training, and one-to-one emails. The KDE provides support to identified schools through the coordination of District Support Facilitators (DSF), Achievement Gap Coordinators (AGC), and Highly Skilled Educators (HSE). The DSFs help build district capacity to put a "name and face" with disaggregated data and to identify research-based instructional strategies. The AGCs provide direct services to address closing the achievement gap. The HSEs focus on whole school improvement. The KDE also conducts focused-monitoring for districts with identified schools.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) provides on-going technical assistance to districts identified for improvement and corrective action. The KDE is currently taking corrective action toward forty-three districts that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for four years. The KDE provides a system of assistance through one of the following:

--Partnership Assistance Team (PAT) - A five-member team (with representatives from KDE, Kentucky Association of School Superintendents and Kentucky School Boards Association) supports the district in implementing the improvement plan.

--State Assistance Team (SAT) - KDE cross-agency staff supports the district in implementing the improvement plan.

--Network Assistance Team (NAT) - The district participates in a network proven effective in improving student achievement and building leadership capacity for support in implementing the improvement plan.

KDE staff review and approve the revisions to the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan for districts in corrective action. Additional revisions may be made based on the review. The plan must be implemented as soon as possible. The KDE also requires these districts to defer Title I, Part A funds, which are used to support the work generated from the assistance team and the district improvement plan.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice		Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		40
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		36
How many of these schools were charter schools?		0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		320
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		70526
Optional Information:		
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:		
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.		
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.		
Comments: Many districts with only one school in a grade span (or with all identified schools) were not able to enter into agreements with neighboring districts regarding the option to transfer. In other cases where the option was available, many parents selected for their children to remain in their "home" school.		
There is no Charter School legislation in Kentucky. The Optional Information is not available.		

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	77
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	3079
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	43748
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Optional Information is not available.	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	179802	174247	96.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	17042	16719	98.10
Low-Poverty Schools	21627	21397	98.90
All Elementary Schools	77918	76931	98.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	20655	18940	91.70
Low-Poverty Schools	31796	30804	96.90
All Secondary Schools	101707	97159	95.50
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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 if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	16.42
b) 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	58.29
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.29
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	28.38
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	60.52
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.10
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	72.00	42.60
Poverty Metric Used	The poverty metric used was based upon the percentage of the student population who qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.	
Secondary Schools	59.80	34.10
Poverty Metric Used	The poverty metric used was based upon the percentage of the student population who qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	100.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>Yes</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>Yes</u>

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

Establishing

Since the September 1, 2003 submission outlining the development and dissemination of the draft English Language Proficiency Standards for Kentucky Schools, several steps have been taken towards further compliance with NCLB requirements under section 3113(b)(2).

The draft State English language proficiency standards (ELP) provide learning goals and qualitative descriptions of English language skills and performances along different performance levels (beginning, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, advanced, exit or proficient) on the English language development continuum. These learning goals and performance descriptions are provided for all four domains of Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing.

The State English Language Proficiency Standards Advisory Committee, composed of local K-12 and higher education representatives, along with public input from parent representatives, endorsed the development of grade span specific Instructional Companions to the draft Kentucky English Language Proficiency Standards. These instructional guides were developed by teachers representing the grade spans of K-5 (elementary), 6-8 (middle school) and 9-12 (high school). These interactive web-based documents were designed for all teachers of English language learners: mainstream, ESL, content area specialists, literacy specialists, special educators, paraeducators, and other support staff at the school and district levels. These guides have provided developmentally appropriate, research-based instructional and assessment strategies that are consistent with the principles of second-language acquisition and academic learning.

Implementing and Operationalizing the New ELP Assessment

In 2005, Kentucky requested and was granted an extension by the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) to implement the NCLB-compliant ELP assessment in spring 2007. In order to ensure a rigorous, thorough and defensible process of selecting and implementing the best ELP assessment, the State also researched the current commercial tests available and collected information and data. As a result, it was recommended that Kentucky join the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium, whose ELP standards were developed based on the research and advice of nationally recognized experts in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). These standards address the state academic content standards from three sources: pedagogy, assessment and educational policy.

In May 2006, Kentucky ESL educators, assessment experts, and other stakeholders participated in a review to compare WIDA ELP standards to the draft English Language Proficiency Standards for Kentucky Schools (2003). Following this independent review and other extensive research, a recommendation was made to KDE leadership for Kentucky to adopt ACCESS for ELLS as its new statewide NCLB-compliant assessment for English language proficiency. Kentucky joined the WIDA consortium on July 1, 2006.

September 7-8, 2006, WIDA conducted an alignment study with Kentucky educators and assessment experts, including mainstream and ESL teachers, content area specialists, literacy specialists, and special educators. The study included aligning the ELP standards, the WIDA standards, and Kentucky Core Content Standards for Assessment. Results of this study are expected in December 2006.

Kentucky will present the results of the alignment to the National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) and seek their guidance to resolve any technical or psychometric issues.

The WIDA ELP standards, The English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12: Frameworks for Large-Scale State and Classroom Assessment, are the product of a consortium of states called World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA). There are five ELP standards that center on the language needed and used by English language learners (ELLs) to succeed in school: social and instructional, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Each of the five ELP WIDA standards encompasses the four language domains as required for K-12 by Title III: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The standards were developed by WIDA as a result of research-based theories and data from studies, including partners such as the Illinois Resource Center (IRC) and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). Each standard is illustrated by model performance indicators (MPIs), which are functional, measurable indices of the four language domains and aimed at the targeted age/developmental levels of ELLs. These MPIs are adapted from the preK-12 ESL standards (1997) developed by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and the academic content standards of member states in the WIDA consortium.

The Department's final recommendation to the Kentucky Board of Education for the new ELP standards that are aligned to the State's academic content standards will be submitted in order to comply with the 2006-07 timeline as described in the Kentucky official response to findings of the April 10-14, 2006, Title III OELA monitoring visit.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

Title III guidance requires that states demonstrate alignment between English language proficiency standards and state academic standards so that the English language proficiency standards pave a pathway for English language learners to achieve challenging state academic standards.

In 2003-04, work was begun to link ELP standards to the state grade-span specific Performance Level Descriptions for four content areas that provided schools with guidance on the specific types of performances that all students are expected to be able to demonstrate during ongoing and summative state academic assessments. Work was also undertaken to link Performance level descriptions for Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science interactively to the ELP standards, but Kentucky revised the Core Content for Assessment and the Program of Studies for Kentucky Schools in 2005-06. As a result, the decision was made in April 2005 to request an extension of the spring 2006 deadline for states to implement a new standards-based ELP assessment so that the ELP assessment could be included in the Kentucky Request for Proposals (RFP) from test vendors, as required by Kentucky law. Permission to postpone implementation until the spring 2007 testing window was granted by Assistant Deputy Secretary, Kathleen Leos (March 22, 2006).

July 1, 2006, Kentucky joined the WIDA consortium and an alignment study was conducted by WIDA in partnership with the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) on September 7-8, 2006, involving local K-12 mainstream and ESL educators and assessment experts, including instructional coaches and special education advisors who work with LEP students. The work of this group involved a review of State English language proficiency standards, State academic content and student achievement standards, and the WIDA ELP standards for degree of alignment. A final report of the results from the alignment study is expected from WIDA by December 2006.

Using the results of the alignment, the ELP Advisory Committee will conduct a gaps analysis and standards setting spring 2007 followed by a recommendation to the State for revising The English Language Proficiency Standards and subsequent link to the State academic core content for assessment standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

The State assures the annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12 in several ways: the Kentucky comprehensive plan for providing technical assistance and professional development to local educational agencies and schools includes monitoring the identification, placement and assessment of LEP and Immigrant students; the Kentucky data collection system, Software Technology Incorporated (STI), was modified in 2005-06 to include fields for the new statewide ELP assessment, ACCESS; professional development workshops for Districts with Emergent ELL Populations took place September 29, October 16, and October 17, 2006, in three Kentucky regions; and three one-day trainings for Entering, Interpreting, and Using STI Data occurred September 26, October 11, and November 16, 2006.

These trainings were open to all Title III-served districts and address the need for all Title-III subgrantees to collect and report more accurate ELP data starting with the 2006-07 school year. The newly revised STI LEP Standards 9.0 reflects all the modifications to the system that were implemented and these documents were distributed during the summer 2006 by KDE trainers. A new policy was created that requires districts to enter data for LEP and Immigrant students submit LEP data monthly to the State instead of annually. This change ensures a more accurate record of the identification and assessment of LEP and Immigrant students. Students receive a unique identification number that will improve tracking of data given the high mobility rate for this sub-population. Four train-the-trainer workshops for administering the new ACCESS for ELLs assessment included cross-agency collaboration between the Office of Teaching and Learning (Title III Program), and the Office of Assessment and Accountability. As a result, district assessment coordinators work closely now with ELL test administrators to improve monitoring of the annual assessment of all LEP students K-12.

ELP Assessment(s) and ELP Standards

During the 2002-03 school year, the Kentucky Department of Education, using appropriate advisory committees, determined the standards and measurable achievement objectives for the attainment of English language proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and comprehension by limited English proficient children and immigrant youth. The context for this process was Kentucky standards for all students. Performance standards were established, and in May 2003, Kentucky submitted the annual measurable achievement objectives and any additional standards for attainment of English language proficiency.

Subsequent revisions to the State content standards (2005-06) and the adoption of the ACCESS for ELLs annual ELP assessment (July 2006) required an alignment study (September 2006) to ensure that the new ELP assessment addressed the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension included in the existing State ELP standards and the WIDA ELP standards used in the ACCESS. The WIDA K-12 English language proficiency standards for large-scale state assessment underwent formal review at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, DC in August 2003. Eighteen representatives from consortium states and outside experts participated in the vetting process. Developed by WIDA in partnership with the Illinois Research Center (IRC) and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), ACCESS was designed based on five English language proficiency standards that reflect the social and academic dimensions of acquiring a second language that are expected of English language learners in grade levels K-12 in the five domains. Each WIDA ELP standard addresses a specific context for language

acquisition (social and instructional settings as well as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and is divided into four grade level clusters: K-2, 3-5,6-8 and 9-12.

A fully-aligned ELP assessment that is standards-based will be administered during the spring 2007 testing window. The technical quality of ACCESS was assured by an extensive review of the ACCESS technical manual by the State's Office of Assessment and Accountability.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	6507	64.00
2. Japanese	460	5.00
3. Bosnian	404	4.00
4. Vietnamese	291	3.00
5. Other	225	2.00
6. Chinese, Mandarin	215	2.00
7. Arabic	203	2.00
8. Serbo-Croatian	145	1.00
9. Russian	141	1.00
10. Somali	138	1.00
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data														
2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III														
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LAS/IPT	10043	98.70	3622	36.10	2447	24.40	990	9.90	2984	29.70	2984	29.70	1168	11.60
Comments:														

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year.
- (3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
5752	2456	2

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

In collaboration with Title III consultants and The Office of Internal Administration and Support, Division of Budgets, and with input from the Kentucky OELA program officers, the State developed three models to consider for a new calculation of the substantial increase in Immigrant children and youth. After comparing the results of the models, a recommendation was made to KDE leadership that the model using a \$10,000 base and an increase of 5 Immigrant students be adopted for the 2006-07 school year. This model revealed that the revised system would allow several districts/LEAs to be eligible for funding for immigrant students who were ineligible in the past. In addition, some districts would become eligible for Immigrant funding who were not eligible for Title III funding. Therefore, the revised system results in greater uniformity in allocating Title III funds to districts experiencing significant increases in immigrant children and youth. This new system is being implemented for the FY2006-07 year; as a result, a notification letter from the State was sent to eligible entities along with tentative allocation announcements for Title III Immigrant funding in September 2006.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE**Grades 2-12**

Kentucky LEP students in Grades 2-12 whose summation of 10 or 11 for Oral, Reading and Writing proficiency levels on the LAS mapped onto the Attained (At) level on the state English Language Proficiency Standards were considered to have attained English language proficiency. Kentucky LEP students in Grades 2-12 whose summation of 9 for Oral, Reading and Writing proficiency levels on the IPT mapped onto the Attained (At) level on the state English Language Proficiency Standards were considered to have attained English language proficiency. The annual attainment goal (state or district) is the percentage of LEP students in each cohort who attained English language proficiency in 2005-2006.

A student who has reached the Attained (At) level will continue to be included in the Attainment percentages of district cohorts until he/she is officially exited from LEP status according to district policy.

Grades K-1

Kentucky LEP students in Grades K-1 whose Oral proficiency level on the Pre-LAS/LAS Oral or the Pre-IPT/IPT Oral mapped onto the Attained (At) level on the state English Language Proficiency Standards were considered to have attained English language proficiency.

Attainment is achieved if the student has a Pre-LAS/LAS level of 5 or Pre-IPT/IPT level of 3, based on the Oral assessment.

In conjunction with ELP test scores, districts may use other criteria in determining attainment of English language proficiency, such as pre-literacy assessments, formative assessments, student performance, and the professional judgment of the team of educators, counselors, parents, and others who developed the LEP student's instructional plan.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

- 1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;**
- 2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).**

STATE RESPONSE

The State revised the AMAO targets to allow a more equitable calculation of progress. Any LEP student in Grades 1-12 enrolled for the first time in a Kentucky school in 2005-06 was not included in the progress calculations since he/she did not have a 2004-05 Kentucky English proficiency level.

Progress Credit -- The numerator of the computation is weighted by the number of Kentucky English Language Proficiency Levels achieved by the student. Going from:

-Beginning to Lower Intermediate is a weight of 1

-Beginning to Upper Intermediate is a weight of 2

-Beginning to Advanced is a weight of 3

-Beginning to a Attained is a weight of 4

-Lower Intermediate to Upper Intermediate is a weight of 1, etc.

Progress for Kindergarten: All kindergarten LEP students in 2005-06 were not included in progress calculations since they did not have 2004-05 Kentucky proficiency levels.

Progress for Grade 1: All grade 1 LEP students were considered to have made progress when the 2005-06 LAS/PreLAS/IPT/PreIPT oral score plus 2 of the student was greater than his/her 2004-05 LAS/IPT oral score plus 2. The plus 2 calculation accounts for the lack of Reading and Writing scores in Grade K and 1. The lowest possible score a student can obtain for the Reading and Writing assessments is a 1.

Progress for Grade 2: All grade 2 LEP students were considered to have made progress when the 2005-06 Kentucky proficiency level of the student was greater than the summation of his/her 2004-05 LAS/IPT oral score plus 2. The plus 2 calculation accounts for the lack of Reading and Writing scores in Grade 1. The lowest possible score a student can obtain for the Reading and Writing assessments is a 1.

Progress for Grades 3-12: A LEP student was considered to have made progress when he/she gained one or more Kentucky Proficiency Level(s) (B, LI, UI, Ad, At) from 2004-05 to 2005-06.

Progress by Cohort: The number of 1-12 students in a Cohort with Kentucky Proficiency Levels in 2005-06 for which there were individual student matches to Kentucky Proficiency Levels in 2004-05 determined the N Count for Progress by Cohort (minus the students who have been at the Attained level in the last two years. The percentage of Progress for each Cohort was computed by dividing the total number of LEP students in the cohort who made Progress (numerator) as weighted above, by the total Cohort N count - less the Attained (denominator).

Meeting the Progress AMAO: A district is considered to have MET the Progress AMAO for a Cohort (Y for Yes) if the state % Progress AMAO (goal) for that Cohort is the same as the actual % of Progress by Cohort of the district or is within the upper limit of the confidence interval (high CI%) for the district cohort.

A district is considered to have NOT MET the progress AMAO for a cohort if their high CI is under the state 59%

Progress AMAO (goal).

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Kentucky LEP students with formal schooling were placed into five cohort groups based on the number of years enrolled in an English language instructional program. Year 1 Cohort refers to students who have received less than two years of English language instruction, and Year 5 Cohort refers to students who have received five or more years of English language instruction in or out of the district. The State goal is for these LEP students to make annual progress at a rate that will enable them to attain English language proficiency in five years of English language instruction.

Kentucky LEP students with limited or no formal schooling were placed into seven cohort groups based on the number of years enrolled in an English language instructional program. The State goal is for these LEP students to make annual progress at a rate that will enable them to attain English language proficiency in seven years of English language instruction.

Protocol Used for the Determination of Cohorts

Step 1: The Number of Years a K-12 student has been enrolled in a US based on a calculation from the First US School Entry date.

Step 2: If information referenced in Step 1 was invalid or missing, the date Identified LEP was used to calculate the Number of Years in a US School.

Step 3: If information referenced in Step 1 and Step 2 was invalid or missing, the date Enrolled LEP was used to calculate the Number of Years in a US School.

When the three preceding steps do not produce a usable value for determining a cohort, the student will be placed in Cohort 1 (under two years in US school).

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 59.00	# 3823	% 85.00	# 3174	% 20.00	# 2017	% 29.50	# 2999

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

Actual Progress Percentage (85%) is a result of progress levels obtained by tested LEP students. A Student gets credit for each level he or she progresses, therefore the percentage is capable of being more than 100%. The State caps the percentage at 100% for reporting purposes.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	59.00	3151	85.90
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		3302	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	20.00	2984	29.80
TOTAL		7156	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	31
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	27
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	28
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	29
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	25
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments			
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		
	#	%	
3	90	68.00	
4	106	76.00	
5	99	71.00	
6	43	49.00	
7	48	52.00	
8	33	50.00	
H.S.	36	47.00	

Comments: Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8 in reading to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments			
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		
	#	%	
3	103	54.00	
4	71	51.00	
5	92	66.00	
6	30	34.00	
7	32	34.00	
8	25	38.00	
H.S.	17	32.00	

Comments: Augmented NRTs were given in grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 in mathematics to meet the grades 3-8 testing requirement for NCLB but were not counted for accountability purposes per approval from USDOE as part of the accountability workbook. Accountability was based on those grades where the Kentucky Core Content Tests were given, since only one year of data exists for the augmented NRTs and these will not be used in the future.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	82.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Data on sub-populations is not available.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5.90
Hispanic	5.20
White, non-Hispanic	3.20
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	4.10
Female	2.90

Comments: There were shifts in the dropout rate of students for certain sub-populations. Also, certain sub-populations are not collected.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

A total of 175 instructional days.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	157	157
LEAs with Subgrants	19	19

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	1380	1568
1	342	1243
2	205	914
3	497	963
4	496	719
5	504	680
6	358	649
7	506	700
8	406	646
9	417	918
10	350	670
11	433	506
12	432	556

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	72	92
Doubled-up	5279	9146
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	61	94
Hotels/Motels	49	67
Unknown	865	1333

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	1568
1	1243
2	914
3	963
4	719
5	680
6	649
7	700
8	646
9	918
10	670
11	506
12	556

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

737

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

57

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

49

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	956
English Language Learners (ELL)	742
Gifted and Talented	113
Vocational Education	0

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	19
Expedited evaluations	19
Staff professional development and awareness	19
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
Transportation	19
Early childhood programs	19
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	19
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	19
Counseling	19
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	19
Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
School supplies	19
Referral to other programs and services	19
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	19
Other (optional)	19
Comments: Supplemental Services and Recreational Programs	

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	19
Comments: Unaccompanied youth continues to be a problem.	

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
N/A	0
	0
	0

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	120	34
Grade 4	Yes	533	225
Grade 5	Yes	611	134
Grade 6	Yes	413	36
Grade 7	Yes	539	116
Grade 8	Yes	454	101
Grade 9	Yes	472	36
Grade 10	Yes	327	54
Grade 11	Yes	349	79
Grade 12	Yes	345	11

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	120	27
Grade 4	Yes	533	118
Grade 5	Yes	611	165
Grade 6	Yes	413	113
Grade 7	Yes	539	20
Grade 8	Yes	454	49
Grade 9	Yes	472	63
Grade 10	Yes	327	< n
Grade 11	Yes	349	31
Grade 12	Yes	345	52

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.